

MRS. ELIZABETH KEMP:

TO YOU, MY DEAR SISTER,

As a Lover of Truth,

PERMIT ME TO DEDICATE

This Volume;

HOPING ITS DEFENSE MAY, THROUGH THE

POWER OF GOD, BE PRODUCTIVE

OF GOOD.

THIS IS THE WISH OF

YOUR BROTHER IN CHRIST,

T. J. FISHER.

137332

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1858, by

T. J. FISHER,

**In the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the
District of Kentucky.**

**HANNA & Co., PRINTERS,
Louisville.**

Printed in the United States of America

INTRODUCTION.

“Blessed are ye when men shall speak all manner of evil of you for my sake.”

IN coming before the world as a disputant, “contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints,” I do not flatter myself with the hope that I shall escape detraction and calumny.

The watch-word and battle-cry has already gone forth. From the elevated summit of Bethany, the oracle has given forth his voice, and thousands will echo it wherever this little book shall find its way.

But rather than defend myself against calumny, baseless as was ever uttered, I shall let one whom, though dead, yet speaks from his grave, tell the story of my persecution and plead my cause—that *one* is the loved, the lamented, the sainted John Lightfoot Waller.

Generous and kind hearted was my deceased friend and brother; yet, with a point and power, could he, like his divine Master, call things by their right names, and drag falsehood from its hiding-place, and expose its deformity to the world.

I, therefore, give his language unchanged; it tells the whole story:

[From the Baptist Banner, December 27, 1838.]

MR. CAMPBELL NAILED TO THE WALL.

We have several times alluded to Mr. Campbell's base slander upon the character of brother Fisher, in the 9th number of the 2d volume of the *Millennial Harbinger*. We now insert his remarks that our readers may see with what reckless composure he can make "most hellish meals of good men's names." The safety of community demands that such a man should be avoided as a pestilence. His breath is a moral simoon. His tongue "outvenoms all the worms of Nile." Here follows his libel:

FISHER, THE REVIVALIST.

MADISON, IND., September 8, 1838.

Brother Campbell will much oblige his brethren here, and me particularly, if he will send an account of the time that Fisher, the celebrated *revival* preacher, was a member of the Church, and the cause of his separation. Living at some distance from Middletown at that period, I can not recollect the circumstances distinctly. The reason of this request is, he came to this place last week to get up a revival: a day or two after he came, I mentioned to some of the brethren that he *had been* a member of our body; it came to his ears, and on the night of Wednesday last, he stated from the pulpit that the report was a slander, and that he had never been connected with us either by letter, baptism, experience, or any other way; and took occasion, of course, to say many things of us to prejudice the minds of his hearers. He left town the next morning at 4 o'clock, which prevented my having an interview with him on the subject.

The *cause* is gaining slowly here at present; however, as the disciples are apparently in earnest, the work will go on.

G. O. ROBINSON.

P. S.—I will just add, that Fisher could not effect his object; so raised some money and left.

G. O. R.

Fisher, the Baptist revivalist, was once reckoned a brother among the disciples, and was a member of a church near Middletown, Pa., from which he was excluded for disorderly and unchristian behavior. I think his exclusion, with that of a Mr. Peabody, of similar stamp, took place in the fall of 1831 or 1832. Is it possible that he, a celebrated revivalist among the Baptists, denies that he ever was in communion with our brethren! He brought a letter of introduction to me from brother Daniel Gano, of Cincinnati, July, 1831, after having spoken as a Reformer in the Sycamore meeting-house. We could not allow him to speak because of his ignorance of the scriptures and of language. Having tormented us with his bombast, we bade him be silent and go to school. He went to school, but could not endure the restraints of the Church, became disorderly, and was, for minor immoralities, finally excluded. He went to Pittsburg; got in with the

Baptists there, perhaps through their opposition to us; and, after some time, they found him no great gain, and he left. He is now a fellow-revivalist with his Methodist brother Maffit. *Par nobile fratrum!*
A. C.

Of Robinson and Campbell we may well retort the quotation, "*par nobile fratrum,*" and such another duumvirate can scarcely be found in the universe. Robinson propagates a report to the injury of his neighbor, and when it is denied, has to write several hundred miles to ascertain whether he has told the truth or a falsehood! His own acknowledgment, that he asserted in Madison that brother Fisher had been a member of a Campbellite church, and then stating in his letter to Campbell that he could *not recollect distinctly* whether he ever had been or not, and requesting to be informed on that subject, stamps the moral assassin upon the front of his character in lineaments as palpable and as ineffaceable as the mark set by the Almighty upon the visage of Cain. Yet Mr. Campbell does not hesitate to pander to the appetite of such a glutton of better men's characters!—to lend his pen and his Harbinger to propagate and give credit to his falsehood!

That brother Fisher was once tinctured with Campbellism, and that he may have "broken the loaf" with them some eight or ten years ago, is not denied. We believe he admits it, and has long since repented of it "in sackcloth and ashes." The same may be said of brother Vardeman, than whom the Baptist denomination never had a more pious, more useful, and more beloved minister. The same, if we mistake not, was true of the lamented Warfield, and of many others that might be named. They, for a while, advocated the sentiments of Mr. Campbell, "broke the loaf" with his followers; but after more attentively comparing his "moonstruck reveries" with the Bible, renounced them—looked back and turned back. But they never left the Baptist Church—they never joined a Campbellite "congregation." If our information be correct, at the time alluded to by Mr. Campbell, his followers had no church at Middletown. Two of his daughters, two of his brothers-in-law, and some two or three students, whose membership was at Bethany and other reformed churches, used occasionally to meet and "break the loaf;" but unless it is in accordance with the beauties of the reformation for persons to be members of two churches at once, there was no church of Mr. Campbell's order in or near Middletown.

at that time. Such is our information on the subject. So all that Mr. Campbell says on that subject is *untrue*.

But to put the finishing touch to this matter, and most effectually to brand Mr. Campbell as a slanderer in his insinuations that brother Fisher was excluded for "minor immoralities" (a statement which the Campbellites themselves can not believe; for they rarely exclude a man even for *major* immoralities), and to prove that all he has said was designed to make a false and slanderous impression, the following letter is subjoined. We ask Mr. Campbell's warmest admirers to read it, to weigh well its contents, and then impartially to assign him his appropriate place in society. We ask no more; we could not wish our worst enemy a lower situation, unless it was to reduce him to the level of Robinson.

P. S.—Perhaps it would be well enough to remark, barely to show how reckless Mr. C. is of truth, that brother Fisher is NOT "now a fellow-revivalist with his Methodist brother Maffit."

PITTSBURG, December 10, 1833.

To the Editor of the Baptist Banner:

DEAR BROTHER: I am requested to state the facts connected with Brother T. J. Fisher's membership in the church with which I am identified. They are as follows: He came to a church-meeting held on the 6th of March, 1831, presented a good letter of dismission from David's Fork Regular Baptist church, Fayette county, Kentucky, and made the following statements: That he had been induced to believe, by Mr. Campbell, and others, that he (Mr. C.) was engaged in giving instructions in the Greek language and theology to a class of young men at his place of residence, and that he had been urged to attend his instructions, with the view of becoming more able and efficient in advocating Mr. C.'s dogmas, which (he said) he had partially espoused. But when he came to see Mr. C., he found (as he said) that he had been deceived—that there was no such school under the supervision of Mr. C.; and, upon expressing his disappointment, Mr. C. directed him to the Academy at Middletown, several miles distant, taught by Mr. Sloan, now a Presbyterian minister. He also stated that there was a small number of the followers of Mr. C. near to that place, with which he met for some time, until he was convinced that they held unscriptural tenets, and that then he withdrew from their meetings, and publicly, in the Methodist meeting-house of that place, renounced their sentiments. For non-attendance and renunciation, (he said), he was informed that they had instituted a mock trial, and had passed sentence of exclusion upon him; but never having given them his letter of dismission from the church in Kentucky, he did not consider himself a member with them, although they claimed him as such; and that, therefore, he cared nothing for the stigma, believing that he was in the path of duty, and that it was persecution for righteousness' sake. These were, substantially, his statements.

His letter from the David's Fork church being some months old, it was necessary that he should give other testimony of his good moral

conduct during the interim, than the fact of his being in company with Mr. C.'s followers; so that he presented a letter of recommendation of good moral character and studious habits, from Mr. Sloan, the teacher of the seminary at which he attended, of, then, recent date, for the satisfaction of the church.

The time Mr. Fisher received a license from the church, and his regular dismissal in good standing, are also matters of record upon our church-book.

In regard to his behaviour while with us, it is my happiness to state that it was, as far as I know, unexceptionable. He daily recited to me, and with considerable diligence pursued the studies assigned him, preparatory to the work of the ministry. Yours, &c.,

S. WILLIAMS,

Pastor of the First Baptist Church, Pittsburg.

It would have been thought that the foul calumny were now dead, and that not even the shadow of its ghost would ever again be heard of. Not so, however. To destroy T. J. Fisher was an object, and to gain that object no means were to be left untried. But let J. L. Waller speak again:

[From the Baptist Banner and Pioneer, July 4, 1839.]

ANOTHER NAIL DRIVEN INTO A. CAMPBELL.

“He uttered falsehoods of enormous size,
With countenance as grave as truth besecmed.”

POLLOCK.

The readers of the Banner and Pioneer will remember that, in December last, we noticed and exposed a slander upon the character of elder T. J. Fisher, published in Mr. Campbell's Millennial Harbinger. The case was this: a Mr. Robinson, of Madison, Ind., in September, 1838, while brother Fisher was holding a protracted meeting there, to injure brother F. and the meeting, put in circulation certain reports, which brother F. publicly denied. Robinson could not make good his charges. He wrote to Mr. Campbell, stating his dilemma, confessing that he had propagated these slanderous charges without *recollecting the circumstances distinctly*, and entreating Mr. Campbell to lend him assistance. The worthy editor of the Harbinger, nothing loth to injure his neighbor, very promptly responded to the request of Robinson, alleging that brother F. was formerly a member of a Campbellite church near Middletown, Pa., from which he was excluded for “minor im-

moralties," for "disorderly and unchristian behaviour." These charges we denied in our paper of the 27th December last; and Mr. Campbell, after six months' delay, in his June number, gives the following bungling defence of his charges. We insert it because we are willing that the world may see what brother F.'s worst enemies, after a laborious search into his character, can say of him, although Mr. Campbell studiously withholds from the readers of the Harbinger what is said in defence. But innocence and truth have nothing to fear; so here is the result of Mr. C.'s six months' search into the schoolboy days of brother F.'s life:

FISHER, THE REVIVALIST.—Many of our readers have doubtless heard of Mr. *Fisher*, the celebrated Baptist revivalist, who has even surpassed his master, Mr. Maffit, some Baptists being judges, in his declamatory eloquence and power of fascination. They will also remember that in September last I was asked by a brother Robinson, of Madison, Ind., whether this Mr. Fisher had not been excluded from one of our churches for unchristian conduct; Mr. Fisher having, from the "sacred desk," in that town, denied that he ever was connected with any of our churches, "by letter, baptism, experience, or *any other way*." In the face of this public denial, when called upon, I feel it my duty to sustain the veracity of brother Robinson, and to declare the fact that the said Fisher "*was once reckoned a brother among the disciples, and was a member of a church near Middletown, Pa., from which he was excluded for disorderly and unchristian behaviour.*" For this testimony I am spoken of in the following terms by *John L. Waller*, the editor of the "Baptist Banner," Ky., December 27, 1838:

Mr. Campbell Nailed to the Wall.—We have several times alluded to Mr. Campbell's base slander upon the character of brother Fisher, in the 9th number of the 2d volume of the *Millennial Harbinger*. We now insert his remarks that our readers may see with what reckless composure he can make most hellish meals of good men's names. The safety of community demands that such a man should be avoided as a pestilence. His breath is a moral simoon. His tongue "out-venoms all the worms of Nile."

I can make no comment on this "fruit of the spirit" of this organ of the Baptist denomination. It speaks for itself. It very appositely illustrates at least a portion of

our present essay on the morality of Christians and of the religious press. One would imagine that a person of much conscientiousness, who would dare thus publicly to deny a matter so easily tested, would, from self-respect, if he hates us more than he hates Satan, have strong evidence that he had spoken unadvisedly on the subject. But it appears that he had not one word of counter testimony whatever, except Mr. Fisher himself; and yet, without any other evidence than that of the accused, expresses himself in the above unenviable style! He has not backed his assertion by a single witness; and even in the attempt to justify Fisher, or rather to extenuate and prevaricate for him, he shows that he knew he had been one of us at the very time he so presumptuously denied my declaration, and seeks to quibble about the organization of the particular church in which he was at the time a member. Here is his proof:

If our information be correct, at the time alluded to by Mr. Campbell, his followers had no church at Middletown. Two of his daughters, two of his brothers-in-law, and some two or three students, whose membership was at Bethany, and other reformed churches, used occasionally to meet and "break the loaf;" but unless it is in accordance with the beauties of the reformation for persons to be members of two churches at once, there was no church of Mr. Campbell's order in or near Middletown at that time. Such is our information upon the subject. So all that Mr. Campbell says on that subject is *untrue*.

His proof is all founded upon "IF his information be correct." What a conscience!! Such a bull of defamation resting upon one IF—upon the hypothetically true information of the accused and excommunicated Fisher himself!!

But it is in this case, as our traducers ought long since to have learned, a disastrous affair to them to put us to the proof of our morality in any matter which concerns their reputation. Out of Mr. Fisher's own mouth we shall convict him. He wrote as follows to the Postmaster at Middletown, Pa., about the time the Baptist Banner was undertaking his defence. This epistle clearly exhibits in what an agony he was to get out of the falsehood he proclaimed from the "sacred desk" in Indiana, and how reckless he was as to the means:

GREENSBURG, KY., December 4, 1838.

Mr. P. M.

DEAR SIR: You will confer a favor on me by letting me know where Mr. James Sloan lives at this time. Please let me know whether the

Campbellites have a church at Pleasant Hill or not. Let me know what has become of black Israel, and whether he belongs to the Campbellites as yet, and what is his character. Please let me know what has become of John Agnew, W. Lindsey, Robert Sloane, and Mr. Neale, who were at Pleasant Hill Seminary at the time I was, in the fall of 1830. I shall visit Middletown in the spring, no providential hindrance. Write, if you please, forthwith. Your friend,

T. J. FISHER.

P. S.—I wish you to ascertain if the Campbellites ever had a regularly constituted church at Pleasant Hill Seminary, and by whom it was constituted, and in what year.

T. J. FISHER.

Is it not evident from the letter, and from the editorial of the Banner, December 27, 1838, that there was an understanding between Messrs. Fisher and Waller as to the means by which the denial was to be sustained, by disputing the organization of the church that excluded him? The course machinated between these conspirators is as evident as that detailed between Ananias and Sapphira. They both tell the same story; but the sequel will show with what plausibility. Observe, courteous reader, Mr. Fisher does not ask any thing about his own membership, character, nor excommunication; but about some of his fellow-students and fellow-members of the church!! Why did he not ask for Dr. Pinkerton, on whose motion his case was taken up and himself excluded. Perhaps it was because he knew he was at this time in Kentucky!!! Well, I have called upon him for his recollections of the affair, because then a member of that Church, and almost ever since absent from it. He testifies as follows:

BROTHER CAMPBELL:—In reply to your interrogatories I answer: Early in January, 1831, I became acquainted with Mr. Fisher. He was introduced to me as a Christian brother, in fellowship with the congregation meeting for worship at that time about a mile from West Middletown, Washington county, Pa. I soon learned that among the pupils at Pleasant Hill Seminary Mr. Fisher enjoyed very little reputation for prudence or consistency of character. From observation in my daily intercourse with him, I was inclined to think that his indiscretions resulted from intellectual rather than from moral disease, and looked upon him as unfortunate rather than faulty. In February, however, it was thought that the reputation of the church required his expulsion, unless he would give assurances of a speedy reformation. A meeting was appointed for the consideration of his case, at which he failed to attend. The charges preferred against him were substantially these: First, a levity of conduct and an obscenity of conversation wholly incompatible with the Christian profession; and, second, an almost total disregard of the duties of the Lord's day. The writer of this note thought that Mr. Fisher had foregone all claim to the Christian fellowship of the congregation, and that the laws of Christ required, under all the circumstances of

the case, his separation from the body. The church concurred, and he was expelled.

Such are my recollections of a part of Mr. Fisher's religious career at Pleasant Hill Seminary.

L. L. PINKERTON.

Now in Wellsburg, Va., May 19th, 1839.

But we have better testimony than even the unimpeachable testimony of Dr. Pinkerton, and the whole church at Pleasant Hill—better with Mr. Fisher, and better with Mr. Waller, because Mr. Fisher himself inquired for it. The name of Mr. Sloan is first on his list. Mr. Sloan, then a teacher in the Academy at Pleasant Hill—a Presbyterian—a student of theology, and now a minister of the Presbyterian Church. He thought that, because Mr. Sloan was a *Presbyterian*, he might lean a little more towards a Baptist than towards a disciple of Christ. But all Presbyterian ministers are not like Mr. Stiles, nor all Baptist editors like Mr. Waller. I rejoice to think there are hundreds of both Baptist and Presbyterian teachers and professors that would eschew such spirits and their deeds as they would the midnight assassin.

But we shall, without further ceremony, introduce that same Mr. Sloan for whom Mr. Fisher inquires in his epistle:

FRANKFORT, May 11th, 1839.

MR. A. CAMPBELL:

Dear Sir:—In compliance with your request, preferred by Mr. Matthew McKeever, I will endeavor to give you a brief sketch of the history of T. J. Fisher, during his residence at Pleasant Hill Seminary. The first place I ever saw Mr. Fisher was in the pulpit of the Methodist meeting-house in West Middletown. He preached on that occasion; and in his address advocated the distinguishing doctrines held by that society known by the name of Disciples or Campbellites. A portion of his address might be called a critical exercise or lecture, presenting a very learned exposition of a certain portion of the New Testament in the original text. I held an interview with him on the evening of the same day; and professing to have some knowledge of the Greek language, and, from Mr. Fisher's display in Middletown, supposing him to be a linguist, I was disposed to call in question some of his assertions respecting certain Greek words, an exposition of which he had given in his discourse. I soon discovered that he did not know a Greek letter. His conduct during his long stay with us, at the house of Mr. Matthew McKeever, was inconsistent with the character of a preacher of truth and righteousness, which he then professed to be. His walk and conversation were not such as become the gospel of Christ. In the summer of the year 1830, I had the charge (in connection with Mrs. McKeever) of Pleasant Hill Seminary. A congregation of Disciples met regularly in the Academy at that time. During the winter session of the same year Mr. Fisher was a regular student of Pleasant Hill Seminary. He professed to be a member of the church of Disciples which met there. I understood

that charges had been preferred by that church against him during the time he was a student of that seminary, and finally expelled. In the same meeting-house in which Mr. Fisher first proclaimed his sentiments as one of the society of Disciples, I also heard him make a public renunciation of his connection with that community. In speaking of Mr. Alexander Campbell, he said he was a gentleman, and had always treated him kindly; that he believed he was sincere in his adherence to the principles which he advocated; and all that he had to say of him was that he was self-deceived, and as such he pitied him. Of the cause which you plead he spoke unfavorably, acknowledging that there were some good things connected with it; but, as a whole, it was a dangerous and rotten system.

Yours, most respectfully,

JAMES SLOAN.

N. B.—If Mr. Fisher should refer to me for his character, you may present him with this communication.

May I not, then, leave this matter with the community without farther witness or comment? If necessary, scores of such testimony could be obtained. The church at Pleasant Hill existed before Mr. Fisher went to the Seminary, and it exists to this day an independent community, as all our communities are, whose acts are regarded by all churches that know them as the acts of any other congregation in the community.

I need only add that the whole article in the Banner is a palpable evasion of my answer to Mr. Robinson. Not a word in my statement is even denied by Mr. Waller, except that Mr. Fisher is *not* now a fellow-revivalist with Mr. Maffit. He does not say how long since the partnership was dissolved. He may be right; and I may be misinformed as to the *day* when the copartnership ceased; but that does not affect this matter in the least. And I assert, that not one word of my statement concerning Fisher is denied by Waller, notwithstanding all his horrible defamations. This is the man who goes for metaphysical regeneration, and tells his Christian experience!

I am sorry to have to expose such unchristian conduct in any fellow-mortal—much more in a Baptist scribe; but my reputation is very dear to me, and of some value in this community, and it must be sustained. I am sorry to see that Mr. Fisher is not in the least reformed; and that instead of being grateful to me for the kindness I have shown him, and especially for the little that I have said about his character in comparison of what I could have said, he should dare to call my word in question. Surely he can not think that I have forgotten all the meanness

and unrighteousness of his course here about the time of his expulsion. A. C.

REMARKS.—We pass over, with sovereign contempt, Mr. Campbell's cant about the "morality of Christians and of the religious press." Let him perform a lustration on himself, and purge his own press from its pollutions, whose name is *legion*, and then he may with a better face read us a canting lecture. Erase from the voluminous works of Mr. Campbell all the slanders, and misrepresentations, and vituperation which he has heaped upon individuals, communities, and churches, and the paper on which they are printed would be almost as destitute of the stain of printer's ink as when first it left the hands of the manufacturer. All his allusions to our "spirit" and "style" may go for what they are worth, coming from such a source. We are not disposed to deal out honeyed phrases to sweeten the palates that are reeking with the blood of devoured character. We always loathe the individual who would serve the Devil in the livery of heaven—who would buy, and sell, and lie in sermon style, and salutations make in Scripture terms. In short, we despise canting, and if people are offended at our bluntness, or because we can not find a softer term than SLANDERER, for one who wantonly and maliciously assails the character of his neighbor, be it so. We can not play the hypocrite; we will not disguise truth, however nauseating and severe it may appear.

It is marvellous that an individual, so adroit in the art of defamation as Mr. Campbell, should, in his efforts to escape from the consequences of one falsehood, involve himself in several others. Speaking of us, he says: "But it appears that he had not one word of counter testimony whatever, except Mr. Fisher himself; and yet, without any other evidence than that of the accused, expressed himself in the above unenviable style!! He has not backed his assertion by a single witness," &c. Now what must the readers, the admirers, and even the parasites of Mr. Campbell think of his morality, *his love of truth*, when they learn that he wrote these sentences with our paper of the 27th of last December before him, which contained the letter of Elder S. Williams, pastor of the 1st Baptist church in Pittsburg, *disproving* every material allegation made in the Harbinger against brother Fisher, in which not the

remotest allusion was made to our having received one word of information from brother F. touching the matter? The Lord have compassion on the man!

But this is not the worst. In another place he says: "Not a word in our statement is even denied by Mr. Waller, except that Mr. Fisher is *not* now a fellow-revivalist with Mr. Maffit." And, as if not satisfied with this misstatement, a few sentences below he recalls it in part, and boldly affirms that "not *one word* of my (his) statement concerning Fisher is denied by Waller!" It would be enough to put this and that together; but, reader, we denied every material statement made by Mr. Campbell! We did more, *we proved them to be false!* A certain class of men ought to have good memories. The charges against brother Fisher are of a serious nature, and he that preferred them is bound to make them good. Has Mr. Campbell done so? Let us see. He stated that brother Fisher was excluded from the Campbellite church "in *the fall* of 1831 or 1832"—that "he brought a letter of introduction to me (Mr. C.) from brother Daniel Gano, of Cincinnati, *July*, 1831, after having spoken as a Reformer in the Sycamore meeting-house." We not only denied this, but *proved* by Elder Williams, the records of whose church sustain him, that brother Fisher joined the First Baptist church in Pittsburgh on THE 6TH OF MARCH, 1831!! And here he remained an unexceptionable and an exemplary member until he returned to Kentucky, his native State! And yet Mr. Campbell says that we did not deny *one* of his statements! Alas, for poor human nature and the depravity of the *rabbis* of the age!

But again, he introduces the name of *James* Sloane with a great flourish, and with it makes a desperate onslaught upon brother Fisher and ourself. This is the man, exclaims he, inquired for by Fisher—the *first* on the list! Look nearer at the letter of brother Fisher to the Middletown P. M., and you will see that it was *Robert* Sloane (the *third* on the list) that he inquired for!!! Mr. Campbell is certainly in his dotage: his memory was once much better than now! Yet Mr. C. says: "My reputation is very dear to me, and of some value to this community!"

There, then, are three ——— what Mr. C. would deem very harsh and unbecoming in us to call by their appropriate name, standing prominently conspicuous in his article! But we pass on.

The burthen of proof rests upon Mr. Campbell. It devolves upon him, by good and competent witnesses, to establish his heinous charges against brother Fisher. His word will not be taken as evidence. We have already convicted him of several gross prevarications in the article we are examining—prevarications that can not plead the least excuse nor find the smallest palliation in honorable minds—they are wilful and barefaced. If brother F. was ever a member of a Campbellite church near West Middletown, Pa., if he was ever excluded from it for “minor immoralities” and for “disorderly and unchristian behavior,” where ought Mr. C. to have gone for his witnesses to prove these things? Most assuredly to West Middletown, where brother F. then resided, and to the church of Pleasant Hill, of which it is alleged he was a member. Mr. C. says: “The church at Pleasant Hill existed before Mr. Fisher went to the seminary, and it exists to this day an independent community.” Grant it, for the sake of argument, and it is so much the worse for Mr. C.’s cause. This church is but a short distance from Mr. C.’s residence, and, if it exists at all, is composed chiefly of his near relations. It was, doubtless, formed, too, in exact agreement with the pattern showed them in the Millennial Harbinger; that is, *every member was required to sign, in person, his name to the church covenant.* This is according to “the ancient order of things,” as set forth by Mr. C.; and his daughters and brothers-in-law of course must be presumed to act in all things as he would direct. Let it, therefore, be proved that the name of *Thomas J. Fisher*, in his own handwriting, is signed to the church covenant, and Mr. C. has then made good his charge that brother F. was once “a member of a church near Middletown.” This he has not done—this he *can not do.*

And why did he go to other places than Middletown and to other States than Pennsylvania, and not to the members or to the records of the Pleasant Hill church and to the citizens of Middletown for witnesses to prove brother F.’s connection with the church and his “minor immoralities?” Plainly because he could not find any witnesses there to suit his purposes—no companion of a *counterfeiter*, no “noisy *quack* that by profession lies,” who is ever ready to “transact villainies that common sinners durst not meddle with;” in short, *Dr. Pinkerton* was not there, and *James Sloan* was not there. Mr. C. was in Middletown inquiring

into the character of brother F., or, at all events, he wrote there on that subject, for how else did he come in possession of brother F.'s letter to the postmaster? Why then did he not obtain testimony from that place? Was it because he did not feel an interest in the subject? No, for it appears that he opened an extensive correspondence on the subject. Was it for the want of time? His charges were denied full six months before he responded. Was it because Middletown was too far off from his residence? It is at his very door. Why then did he not call on those who must best know the character of brother F. at the time alluded to, and those who only could testify as to his connection with the Pleasant Hill church, for testimony to sustain his charges? We have a fair and equitable right to the conclusion that it was because his charges were false and slanderous, and known to be such by the Pleasant Hill church and the citizens of Middletown. No ingenuity can evade this conclusion; every one must see its force, and even the high-minded of Mr. C.'s own friends will make him feel it. He is a *slanderer* in the most odious acceptation of that word—a wanton villifier of another's character!

But Mr. C. has not even proved that there was such a church at Pleasant Hill at the time alluded to. This he ought to have done, seeing that it was called in question. We now demand of him to show from the records of the church the time of its constitution. His *dictum* on the subject avails nothing with us. We have a right to a certified copy of the records of the church to that point, and we demand it in behalf of brother F. and of the cause of truth.

Before we examine the testimony of the witnesses who have testified for Mr. Campbell, let us revert for a moment to the history of brother F. He was born and raised in Kentucky. He served an apprenticeship to the tailoring business in Lexington, during which time, as we are informed by Dr. T. S. Bell, of Louisville (than whom the *reformation* can boast of no one more respectable and intelligent), his character for morals was irreproachable. He knew him after he was attached to the church, and never knew and never *heard* any thing of him unbecoming his profession. At the January meeting, 1830, of the David's Fork Baptist church, one of the largest and most respectable churches in the west, brother F. was regularly

dismissed by letter. The records of the church show this to be the case. He left Kentucky in the June following, and shortly after visited Mr. Campbell, and then entered the seminary at West Middletown, Pa. On the 6th of March, 1831, as elder Williams testifies, he presented his letter of dismission from the David's Fork church, together with a letter of commendation from the *principal* of the seminary which he had recently quitted, to the First Baptist church of Pittsburg, where he was received, and where he remained an exemplary member until his return to Kentucky. These statements we are prepared to prove if called in question. If, then, brother F. was guilty of unchristian conduct, of disregarding the Sabbath, of "minor immoralities," it was during the short time that he was tainted with Campbellism and kept Campbellite company, and is but a verification of the proverb of the apostle—"Evil communications corrupt good manners." Indeed, from our knowledge of the manners of his associates, we should not have been astonished if he had not escaped contamination. We have known the morals of many Christians ruined by associating with the *reformers*. We have, however, been proffered letters by several individuals well known throughout the country and of the first standing, who were willing to testify to his good moral character during that period, but we have not thought it necessary to use them. They say that except an overweening vanity and a pretension to know every thing, as is the case with all *reformed* "proclaimers" from Bethany to Harrodsburg, his character was unimpeachable. But granting that he was guilty of "minor immoralities," such as "levity of conduct," "disregard of the Sabbath," "unbecoming conversation," &c., we call upon the Campbellite "proclaimers" who are exempt from these sins to throw stones at him. Come, gentlemen, don't depart one by one. Hurl your missiles, Messrs. J. S. Parker, J. P. Lancaster, Dr. Pinkerton, &c., &c., &c., or for ever after hold your peace.

But let us look at the testimony borne by Mr. C.'s convenient witnesses. This Mr. James Sloan who testifies for Mr. Campbell is the gentleman who testified to brother F.'s good moral and Christian character when he left school, as we proved by elder Williams in December last. What he is to receive from Mr. Campbell for certifying the *other way* we know not, nor do we care. He says that

brother F. "*professed* to be a member with the disciples* which met" in the seminary. This language is too indefinite. We insist that Mr. Sloan shall state whether brother F. said he was a member, or that he merely met with the "disciples." But there is a studied vagueness about his statement as well as about that of Dr. Pinkerton which shows that both were *retouched* by Mr. C. Mr. Sloan says that brother F. renounced Campbellism in the very church where he first heard him avow it. This, of course, was before he left Middletown, and must have been some time in February, because on the 6th of the following March he joined the church in Pittsburg. Dr. Pinkerton became acquainted with him in January, and in February he made the motion for his expulsion. Why this concealment of dates? Why does not Mr. Sloan state at what time in February this renunciation took place? And why does not Dr. Pinkerton tell us at what time in the month brother F. was expelled? These are important particulars, and their concealment proves what is the fact in the case, that *this pretended exclusion took place AFTER he renounced Campbellism, and was a base conspiracy to ruin his reputation BECAUSE he had renounced it.* Such a procedure is worthy of the companion of Josiah S. Parker.

But Mr. Sloan is quite a knowing witness. He hails from Frankfort (whether of Kentucky, Germany, or some other part of the world, we are not prepared to say), and yet, at the request of Mr. Campbell, "preferred by *Mr. Matthew McKeever*," (see his letter in our last), he does not hesitate to affirm that brother F.'s conduct during his long stay "at the house of *Mr. Matthew McKeever* was inconsistent with the character of a preacher." Is it not strange that Mr. Matthew McKeever could not testify to these things himself—to what occurred in his own house—without sending all the way to Frankfort to get Mr. Sloan to do it? But this was done at the request of Mr. Campbell, and doubtless because Mr. Matthew McKeever was not so *knowing* as Mr. Sloan, or as Mr. Campbell wished him to be. Mr. Sloan is a remarkable witness; he bears testimony on both sides, and seems endowed with the faculty of knowing whatever Mr. C. wishes him to know. We repeat, he is a remarkably *convenient* witness.

* The technicalities of this certificate incline us very much to the suspicion that Mr. C. himself wrote it, and James Sloan signed it.

We leave the whole matter with our readers, many of whom are personally acquainted with brother Fisher. So far as they are concerned, his defence against the venomous tongue of *Alexander Campbell* was unnecessary and uncalled for. And many of our readers know that Mr. Campbell has slandered the illustrious dead as well as the living. Scarcely was the late Dr. Semple cold in his grave when Mr. Campbell labored to prove that the Doctor had embraced Campbellism before his death, and wrung the hearts of his bereaved family by publishing the foul slander to the world! A slanderer that preys upon the character of the dead can not be expected to spare the living. Where Mr. C. is known, his slanders of brother F. will be duly appreciated. To slander is his vocation. Perhaps, therefore, what we have said on this occasion has been an act of supererogation. At all events we hope never to be under the necessity of noticing him again.

I have thus presented my defense in the burning words of the sainted dead. Of myself I shall say but little. A brief statement in reference to my position in the religious world, is all I shall add.

In 1828 I professed religion, and joined the Presbyterian Church in Paris, Ky. Shortly afterwards I became convinced that I had never been baptized; and, in 1829, was immersed by Elder Jeremiah Vardeman, into the fellowship of the Baptist Church at David's Fork, Fayette County, Ky. In 1831 I visited Mr. Campbell, informed him that I was a member of the Baptist Church at David's Fork, Ky., and showed him my letter of dismission from that body. In the Fall of 1831 I became a student of Pleasant Hill Academy. There being no church of my own faith and order in the vicinity of that place, and being young, inexperienced, and having no prejudices, I broke the loaf with the Disciples who met at that place. **If there was a church at Pleasant Hill, it was composed of**

the following individuals: Mr. Campbell's two daughters, Mrs. McKeever (his sister), Mr. Bryant (his brother-in-law), Mr. C.'s mother, Miss Jane Chapman (his niece), Bob Sloan, Mooney, free George and wife, black Israel, and Pinkerton. If there were any others, I know not—the above-named individuals holding their memberships at Bethany and other places. Mr. Pinkerton confessed to brother Anderson, Pastor of the Christian Church at Louisville, that his membership was not there. It is passing strange, that most of these persons could be members of two churches at the same time.

From having associated with the Disciples, I was claimed by them, and the community called me a Campbellite. These facts I have never denied. While at Pleasant Hill, and previous to the time *they* say I was excluded, Pinkerton and myself had a debate upon the Operations of the Holy Spirit, I taking the affirmative, he the negative; in which debate, it was said, Mr. P.'s heresies were badly used up. Now, gentle reader, think, for one moment, of my being a member of the Campbellite Church, and yet defending Baptist principles against the doctrines of the Reformation, as held and promulgated by Pinkerton. After this debate I was treated coldly by Mr. P. and his brethren. It was then, and not till then, that black Israel raised some lies upon me, which have been handed down by Pinkerton and some of his party for a quarter of a century. They seem determined to persecute me as long as I live; and, perhaps, hyena-like, may seek to disturb the repose of my ashes. If my having communed with and being claimed by the Reformers, constituted me a member, I plead guilty to the charge. By the same mode of reasoning they have,

and might claim hundreds of others. Dr. Babcock, some years ago, visited this State, and broke the loaf with the Reformers, and afterwards visited Mr. Campbell at Bethany, in order to form a closer alliance between the churches of the Reformation and the American and Foreign Bible Society, in the Bible cause. Why do not those churches of the Reformation, with which he broke the loaf, excommunicate and publish him for having deceived them? The sainted Andrew Broaddus was claimed by the Reformers, notwithstanding he denounced their dogmas: why was he not excommunicated and anathematized? If I am not mistaken, he was canonized by Mr. C. Who is it they have not claimed?

At the close of the session at Pleasant Hill Academy, I went to Pittsburg, and there joined the Baptist Church, by letter of dismissal from the Baptist Church at David's Fork, Ky. To the truth of the above statement, the Clerk of the latter and Pastor of the former Church have testified.

I have been a member of the Baptist Church since 1829; was licensed by the Baptist Church in Pittsburg in 1832, and was called to ordination by the Church in Lawrenceburg in 1834; and during this period, have maintained as reputable standing for truth, honesty, and virtue, as most of my fellow-men. My bitterest enemy said of me: "Mr. Fisher, so far as known to me, was never charged with any gross immorality."

In conclusion, I repeat, what I have published again and again, that I NEVER WAS A MEMBER OF ANY CHURCH OF THE REFORMATION.

To the Baptist cause—the cause of God—I have given my energies, my time, my life. If I have been blessed in

my efforts, to God be the glory. If notoriety has been a consequence upon my efforts, upon that notoriety I have paid a severe tax. Calumny and slander have dogged my steps all along the journey; but erect before heaven, I fear no enemy, and forgive all.

T. J. FISHER.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[LETTER TO T. J. FISHER.—DISCUSSION.]

Rev. T. J. FISHER :

Dear Sir,—A short time since I received a letter from several brethren, from Ghent, Ky., stating that you had been there, making some pretty serious assaults upon the Disciples, which drew out from them a proposition for discussion. In reply, they received from you a proposal, of which they sent me a copy, for a discussion of “the distinctive differences between the Disciples and Baptists,” with any of the following: A. Campbell, W. Scott, L. L. Pinkerton, or B. Franklin. My brethren in Ghent have taken your last choice, and placed the matter in my hands. I, therefore, as yours to them contained no proposition, returned them the following for your consideration :

1. Do the Scriptures teach, that baptism, administered as the Lord intended, to a proper subject, is for the remission of past, or alien sins?

2. Do the Scriptures teach, that a Christian experience shall be related, evidence of pardon obtained, or any article of religion acceded to, other than the confession with the mouth, of the belief of the heart, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the Living God, on the part of the penitent believer, before baptism?

3. Are articles of religion, written by uninspired men, as bonds of Christian union and fellowship, detrimental to the progress of the Christian religion, and sinful?

4. Is monthly, instead of weekly meeting, for the commemoration of the Lord’s sufferings and death, attended with other acts of Christian worship, according to ancient usage, or scriptural?

In reply, you send the following :

1. Baptists affirm it is right for us to pray for sinners — Disciples deny.

2. Baptists affirm it is right for sinners to pray for themselves — Disciples deny.

3. Disciples affirm that baptism is for the remission of sins to a penitent believer — Baptists deny.

4. Disciples affirm open Communion to be scriptural — Baptists deny.

5. Baptists affirm the divinity of Christ — Disciples deny.

6. Baptists affirm the total depravity of man — Disciples deny.

7. Baptists affirm an experimental change of heart before baptism — Disciples deny.

Dear Sir : The enclosed propositions I will debate with the Rev. Ben. Franklin. There is no essential difference between him and myself in his third and fourth propositions.

Yours, truly,

T. J. FISHER.

Your closing remark, that “there is no essential difference between him and myself in his third and fourth propositions,” is a clear reason for declining discussion on those propositions. If you grant that “articles of religion, written by uninspired men, as bonds of Christian union and fellowship, are detrimental to the progress of the Christian religion, and sinful;” and that “weekly instead of monthly meeting, for the commemoration of the Lord’s sufferings and death, attended with other acts of Christian worship, is according to ancient usage, or scriptural,” as a matter of course we have no debate on those subjects. Yet, I think, it will perplex you to harmonize this concession with the practice of the Baptist Church. This, however, is no matter of mine.

But, my dear sir, why did you pass my first and second propositions so coolly? Why go on with such a parade of

propositions, without making the slightest objection to, or mention of, these two propositions in any shape? Had you stated some good reason why you could not debate these propositions, there would have been some show of propriety in proposing others. I object to your course as not respectful and courteous.

But I object to your propositions, as follows :

1. No man doubts that it is right to pray for sinners ; nay, more, for all men. There is no issue between Disciples and Baptists, whether it is right to pray for sinners, or all men.

2. There is no dispute between Disciples and Baptists, whether it is right for sinners to pray for themselves. We believe that proper subjects, believing, penitent sinners, should “ arise and be baptized, *calling* on the name of the Lord ;” and that the promise of God is, that whoever thus *calls* upon the name of the Lord shall be saved, or pardoned. This proposition, as stated by yourself, forms no issue upon the *difference in practice* between the parties.

3. Your third contains nothing that is not in my first, and there is, therefore, no reason for substituting it for mine. You must make some valid objection to mine before there can be any reason for offering another.

4. Disciples affirm nothing about “ open communion ” or “ close communion ; ” but below you will find what they affirm. Will you deny it ?

5. Your fifth proposition, in its generous range, proposes to us to deny that “ the saints will persevere through grace to glory ” ! We should be sorry to deny this of the whole of them. We trust that many of “ the saints ” will “ persevere through grace to glory. ” Below you will find a proposition on this point, upon which we deny. Will you affirm it ?

6. “ Baptists affirm the divinity of Christ ” !!! Indeed ! What bold and daring men ! Why, they would affirm that there is a God, or a Savior, I presume ! So do we affirm the divinity of Christ, as often, as strongly, and as devoutly as Baptists.

7. Below you will find a proposition on depravity.

8. We affirm, and in our preaching produce, a divine change of heart, as much as Baptists.

I now present you the following :

1. Do the Scriptures teach, that baptism, administered as the Lord intended, to a proper subject, is for the remission of past, or alien sins? Disciples affirm—Baptists deny.

2. Do the Scriptures teach, that a Christian experience shall be related, in which the penitent professes to have obtained pardon, as practiced by Baptists, before baptism? Baptists affirm—Disciples deny.

3. Do the Scriptures teach, that, in our efforts to convert sinners, as a part of the process in turning them to God, they should come to the mourners' bench to pray and be prayed for, as practiced by Baptists? Baptists affirm—Disciples deny.

4. Do the Scriptures teach, that any Christian, or follower of Christ, any place, where the Lord's table is spread, has the same right to partake of the emblems of the Lord's body and blood, that he has to be in the kingdom of God? Disciples affirm—Baptists deny.

5. Do the Scriptures teach, that saints can apostatize, fall from grace, and be lost? Disciples affirm—Baptists deny.

6. Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine of total hereditary depravity? Baptists affirm—Disciples deny.

The public will desire to know something of the grounds of the debate, if we have one, or the grounds of the failure, if we do not have one. I have, therefore, arranged this letter with an eye to its publication, and preserved a copy for that purpose.

As Covington, Ky., is a central point, easy of access, and many of both parties reside in that community, I suggest that as the place where the discussion shall be held.

Respectfully, yours,

BENJ. FRANKLIN.

CINCINNATI, O., March 3, 1857.

To Rev. T. J. FISHER.

CARROLLTON, March 7, 1857.

Rev. BENJ. FRANKLIN :

Dear Sir,—You say in your letter to me, that “I received a letter from several brethren from Ghent, Ky., stating that you had been there making some pretty serious assaults upon the Disciples.”

The above charge is *not true*, and I challenge the proof and specifications.

In your communication you ask, why I passed your first and second propositions so coolly? A man of your discrimination can certainly see that the substance of your first and second propositions was embodied in the third and eighth of mine to you. You say, “I object to your course as not courteous and respectful.” I intended nothing disrespectful or uncourteous.

Sir, as you and I cannot agree as to the distinctive differences between the Baptists and Disciples, would it not be better to refer this matter to the Baptist Church and Society of Disciples in Ghent; or, if you prefer to make your selection from the following list of propositions, I am ready to meet you, when we can agree upon the time and place :

Proposition First.—Do the Scriptures teach, that baptism, administered as the Lord intended, to a proper subject, is for the remission of past, or alien sins? Disciples affirm—Baptists deny.

Proposition Second.—Baptists affirm an experimental change before baptism, and that it is right to make confession of the same—Disciples deny.

Proposition Third.—Baptists affirm that it is right to pray for sinners at the altar of prayer (not the mourners' bench)—Disciples deny.

Proposition Fourth.—Do the Scriptures teach, that the saints can apostatize, fall from grace, and be lost? Disciples affirm—Baptists deny.

Proposition Fifth.—Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine of total, hereditary depravity? Baptists affirm—Disciples deny.

Proposition Sixth.—Baptists affirm Jesus Christ to be God as well as man—Disciples deny.

Now, sir, you have the propositions for discussion; three of them in your own language, three in mine. You say the public will desire to know the grounds of debate, if we have one, or the grounds of failure, if we do not have one. In conclusion, permit me to say, the Lord willing, “this fellow” will debate certainly, unless the Rev. Benjamin Franklin backs out. You suggest Covington as the place of debate. I have no objection to that place, provided the Baptists and Disciples of Ghent are willing, and likewise that the Baptists and Disciples of Covington desire it.

Yours, respectfully,

T. J. FISHER.

GHENT, Ky., March 14, 1857.

REV. FISHER:

Dear Sir,—Yours of the 7th inst. is at hand, and three propositions are agreed to. This is right; for these three fairly embrace “the distinctive differences between the Disciples and Baptists.” But I do not admire your course, in attempting to dodge the real issue touching the other points. I preach that baptism is for the remission of sins, and come forward and affirm it without equivocation. I believe that saints can apostatize, fall from grace, and be lost, and come up to the work and affirm it without hesitation. The doctrine of total, hereditary depravity, I do not believe, and therefore unhesitatingly deny it. You believe and practice calling sinners forward to the mourners’ bench, anxious seat, or altar of prayer, to pray and be prayed for, as a part of the process in conversion, that they may obtain pardon before they confess Christ and are baptized into him; but when it comes to affirming it, you modestly dodge, leave out the words “as practiced by the Baptists,” and simply affirm that “it is right to pray for sinners at the altar of prayer”!! Why not affirm what

you practice? This you are now bound to do, or have it published to the world that you *will not do it*.

Again: You believe and preach, not only that sinners "must have an experimental change before baptism," but *evidence of pardon*, and that it is right to state that before baptism. This you must also affirm, or shrink from your practice. Dodge it you can not.

The proposition, that "Christ is God as well as man," I will debate if you will deny. I believe that "Christ is God as well as man"—that he is "God with us"—that "in him dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily"—that "he is the express image of the invisible God"—that "he who sees him, sees the Father;" and have so preached for twenty years.

Why have you dropped the proposition on Communion? I cannot let you off silently on that. You must defend your position, or show your brethren that you are ashamed of it. Come, sir, let us look the subject square in the face. In addition to my three propositions to which you have agreed, I propose the following:

1. Any person in the kingdom of God, has the same right to commune, any time, and any place, where the children of God are at the Lord's table commemorating the death of the Savior, that he has to be in the kingdom of God. Disciples affirm—Baptists deny.

2. Do the Scriptures authorize calling sinners forward to pray and have others pray that the Lord may convert them and pardon their sins, as practiced by Baptists, before they are baptized? Baptists affirm—Disciples deny.

3. Do the Scriptures authorize the relating of experiences, in which the candidates profess to have obtained pardon, and give evidence of the same, before baptism, as practiced by Baptists? Baptists affirm—Disciples deny.

Please answer soon and decisively, whether "*this fellow*" will defend what he preaches, or evade it, as I wish the whole to appear in the next issue of the *A. C. Review*, now in the hands of the printer.

I find, on arriving here, that the statement about your serious assaults upon the Disciples, *is true in the fullest sense*, and can be abundantly sustained.

The citizens insist that the debate shall be here.

Respectfully, yours,

BENJ. FRANKLIN.

COVINGTON, March 19, 1857.

REV. BENJ. FRANKLIN :

Dear Sir,—Yours of the 14th inst. is at hand. The three propositions in your own language, to which I have heretofore agreed, and which in your last you say “fairly embrace” the distinctive differences between the Disciples and Baptists, I am still ready to debate. If these three “fairly embrace” the distinctive differences between the parties, and you say they do, what else is there to debate? What other issues do you wish to make? Now, sir, I am ready to meet you upon these, and beg that you do not “dodge” them. I am unwilling, however, that you shall take to yourself the privilege of fixing all the points of issue and terms of debate. And, sir, as you evidently intend to change or “dodge” the true issues in other points of debate, and attempt to trumpet your victory in an unfought battle through the columns of the “A. C. Review” (what is it?) and as we do not disagree upon the divinity of Christ, I propose that you select two men from among the Disciples, and I will select two from among the Baptists, and these four select one from among the worldlings, and place our correspondence in the hands of these five persons, who shall settle the real points of difference upon which we are not agreed as issues in debate.

If, sir, you wish “to look the subject square in the face,” you will not dissent from such a reference as I here propose.

When the points of debate are all agreed upon, and we meet at Ghent, I shall expect you to make out the specifi-

cations and proof of the charge of my having made "serious assaults upon the Disciples" of that place. *This matter you shall not dodge.*

I now reassure you, the Lord willing, "this fellow" will debate, unless I am compelled to look the Rev. Benj. Franklin "square" in the back as he ingloriously retreats.

Yours, respectfully,

T. J. FISHER.

CINCINNATI, O., March 21, 1857.

Rev. T. J. FISHER:

Dear Sir,—Yours of the 19th inst. is at hand, and I shall hasten to respond. I am truly sorry to find your courage failing you, when called upon to defend your practice. In your notice of your meeting in Ghent, in the *Western Recorder* of the 18th, you assert that "that abominable heresy of open communion had been practiced by some of its (the Baptist Church's) most worthy members." Here, sir, is a proposition in your own unequivocal words. You affirm that some of the most worthy members, in the Baptist Church, in Ghent, are guilty of abominable heresy, in occasionally communing with the Disciples. I deny it. You shall defend your position, maintained in that community, on this point, or let it appear to the people that you are conscious that you can not. Your charge of heresy against some of the most worthy members in the Baptist Church in Ghent, is not true. I deny the charge, and you shall defend it, or show that you had no confidence in it when you made it. Will you defend your pompous charge, as it stands, in your own printed words, in the *Recorder*? This you shall now do, or show that you were not sincere when you made it?

You shall also defend your precise practice, in bringing sinners to the mourners' bench, or altar of prayer, as a part of the process in conversion, or show your consciousness that you can not do it. Come, sir, no cringing here.

You know I have offered you a fair proposition, embracing "the distinctive difference" between us on this point; and you must now "face the music," or shrink from your own manifest practice, thus showing that you have no confidence in what you practice.

You preach, and so do all in this crusade with you, that the sinner must give in an experience, evidence of pardon, before baptism. This you shall also defend, or show that "this fellow" will not defend, before an opponent, what he will preach, where no one can reply. Come, sir, remember your pompous words: "I maintained Baptist principles with all the power I possessed;" "the old landmarks were reset." Come, sir, and "defend Baptist principles with all the power you possess," before the same people where you performed this great feat, in the presence of an opponent, or shrink from the task, showing that you know that it can not be done.

Come, my dear sir, these propositions are agreed upon, and consequently it is desired that we *shall meet*, God willing. Take in the other three points, also, and let us make clean work of it. You are now in for a debate, and you had as well be hung for an old sheep as a lamb.

I suggest, as the time, Tuesday after the first Lord's day in April; or, if that will not suit you, just one month later.

I also suggest that we be ruled by the ordinary rules of debate, each choosing one moderator, and these two selecting a third, and continue one day on each point.

Respectfully, yours,

BENJ. FRANKLIN.

CARROLLTON, March 30, 1857.

Rev. BENJ. FRANKLIN:

Sir,—Your last communication is at hand. I regret that necessity compels me to reply to such a document.

Permit me to inform you that I am a Kentuckian, a gentleman, and, I hope, a Christian. I hope, hereafter, you

will not address me as if I were your humble vassal, and *you* my Lord paramount.

I have somewhere read of an animal that put on a lion's skin, but his speech betrayed him.

In relation to the propositions for debate, I have offered every thing that is fair and honorable, as our correspondence will show. I will debate the propositions agreed upon already, and others that may come up during the debate. Sir, as you have not accepted my propositions, I am willing to place our correspondence in the hands of an Atheist, an Infidel, and a Universalist, and let them decide the points of difference between us. *Deo volente*, I will meet you on Friday before the first Sunday in June, in the town of Ghent.

Moderately, respectfully, yours,

T. J. FISHER.

CINCINNATI, O., April 7, 1857.

REV. T. J. FISHER :

Dear Sir,—Owing to my absence, yours of March 30th could not receive attention until now. Your new affirmative proposition, that you are a “Kentuckian, a gentleman, and you hope a Christian,” as it contains nothing about “Baptist principles,” I shall decline debating, as not a vital question to *me*. I am willing the public shall render a verdict in that case without debate.

I am after you as a *Baptist*. It is *your practice as a Baptist* that I challenge you to defend. It is your practice of demanding an experience, containing evidence of pardon, before baptism; of calling up mourners, or seekers, to pray and have others pray for pardon before baptism; and your pompous accusation against some of the “*most worthy members*” in the Baptist Church in Ghent, that they are guilty of “abominable heresy,” that I challenge you to defend. Will you do it, or let it go by default? Can you back out from this, and ever again, as you did in Ghent,

pray for sinners to be pardoned before baptism, demand evidence of pardon before baptism, and publish that some of the most worthy Baptists are heretics?

The proposal to refer forming propositions to Atheists, Infidels, and Universalists, is simply ridiculous.

Hoping that at the time and place mentioned by yourself, I shall meet a "Kentucky gentleman and a Christian," and debate the three questions agreed upon,

I am yours,

BENJ. FRANKLIN.

PRELIMINARIES.

BAPTIST CHURCH, GHENT, KY.,
Friday morning, 10 o'clock, June 5, 1857.

In accordance with a previous arrangement, the discussion between Rev. Benj. Franklin, of Cincinnati, Ohio, and Rev. T. J. Fisher, of Carrollton, Kentucky, commenced in this place to-day, before a large and intelligent audience. Prayer having been offered by the Rev. — Arnold, of Covington, Rev. S. L. Helm rose and read the preceding correspondence, and the subjoined

RULES OF DISCUSSION.

1. The Debate shall commence on Friday, June 5, 1857, in Ghent, Ky., at 10 o'clock, A. M.

2. Each disputant shall select one Moderator, and the two thus chosen shall select a third; and these three shall be an umpire to keep order in the assembly, and confine the speakers within the limits of the following rules :

3. In the opening of each new subject, the affirmant shall occupy one hour, and the respondent the same time; and each thereafter a half hour alternately, to the termination of each subject.

4. On the final negative, no new matter shall be introduced.

5. The propositions for discussion are the following :

I. Do the Scriptures teach, that baptism, administered as the Lord intended, to a proper subject, is for the remission of past, or alien sins? Mr. Franklin affirms—Mr. Fisher denies.

II. Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine of total, hereditary depravity? Mr. Fisher affirms—Mr. Franklin denies.

III. Do the Scriptures teach that the saints can apostatize, fall from grace, and be lost? Mr. Franklin affirms—Mr. Fisher denies.

6. No question shall be discussed more than one day.

7. The parties should mutually consider each other as standing on a footing of equality in respect to the subject in debate. Each should regard the other as possessing equal talents, knowledge, and a desire for truth, with himself; and that it is possible, therefore, that he may be in the wrong, and his opponent in the right.

8. All expressions which are unmeaning, or without effect in regard to the subject in debate, should be strictly avoided.

9. Personal reflections on an opponent should, in no instance, be indulged.

10. The consequences of any doctrine must not be charged on him who maintains them, unless he expressly avows them.

11. As truth, and not victory, is the professed object of controversy, whatever proofs may be advanced, on either side, should be examined with fairness and candor; and any attempt to answer an opponent by arts of sophistry, or to lessen the force of his reasoning by wit, caviling, or ridicule, is a violation of the rules of honorable controversy.

[Signed,]

BENJ. FRANKLIN,
T. J. FISHER.

M O D E R A T O R S .

The Rev. John Smith, of Georgetown, Ky., was chosen by Mr. Franklin, and the Rev. S. L. Helm, of Louisville, Ky., by Mr. Fisher, and by them Col. Lewis Saunders was selected as President Moderator.

DEBATE

ON THE

DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

FRIDAY, JUNE 5, 10 o'clock, A. M.

[MR. FRANKLIN'S OPENING ADDRESS.]

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I feel truly thankful and gratified to meet my worthy friend according to our previous arrangement, and to find him in good health and spirits, and surrounded by his friends, whom, I hope, are equally blessed. I think we will have a very interesting and pleasant interview. I feel thankful that Divine Providence has been pleased to remove the clouds in the atmosphere, giving us a beautiful day; and I hope that the effulgent and glorious beams of divine truth may be shed over our minds this day, as bright as the physical rays the day-god now showers upon this glad earth.

We have met to commence a discussion; but if I know my heart, I have no ambitious desire to gain a victory over a fellow mortal, or of vanquishing one born to be my brother. But

I have an ardent desire, and it is my sincere prayer, that God Almighty's truth may triumph over error, and that the clear light of Heaven will be shown forth to this congregation, that they may embrace, and all their lives live in conformity with it, and at last be received home to their everlasting rest.

The question which we are to discuss this morning is one of the very first magnitude. No question that commands the attention of the people of this generation, is of more importance than the subject of induction into the kingdom of God. No man is prepared to preach Christianity who does not know the first steps of induction into the kingdom of God. And while I rejoice in the opportunity afforded for discussing this great question, I cannot but remark, if there is a question beneath the shining sun that is a matter of deep regret, it is, that there should be any necessity among preachers at this day to discuss the question of induction into the kingdom of God. Are we under the necessity of acknowledging that at this date—past the middle of the nineteenth century—in an age of vast light and intelligence, the preachers of the gospel themselves are not decided upon the steps a man is to take in being introduced into the kingdom of Jesus Christ? I say it is a lamentable concession which we are bound to make. Let us open the oracles of God with child-like

simplicity; let the Word of the Living God be spread out, and let the people hear it. I hope, then, my friends, that we may be enabled to arouse in you a sincere desire to learn the truth.

I have no doubt that some are here present this morning, who are apprehensive that this is going to be a dull and uninteresting controversy, merely about an external ordinance, and probably some of this opinion have felt a little repugnant to the idea of debate, and would prefer that no discussion take place; but, my friends, this discussion is for the purpose of eliciting important truths concerning the nature of this ordinance, which it is as necessary to know as to observe. It seems impossible to get into the minds of this generation the truth relative to our belief as to the qualifications of a person before coming to the ordinance of baptism. They think we have nothing in our minds or hearts, but the simple circumstance of immersing a person in water; that we have no thought of any divine influence of the Spirit, or any divine change of heart, or any change in the feelings, or any thing spiritual in religion; that we have metamorphosed the whole matter into a change in the mind, and a mere nominal ceremonial kind of external formality. Now, I want to state at the commencement, that I repudiate, I abominate, and nothing under the heavens is more repugnant to my feelings (as thousands

throughout these States can testify) than this thing I have now described. I have not found one single man, and I do not believe there is one in the length and breadth of the country, who ever preached any such theory as this I have so briefly described. I will state in the beginning, that no person ever did, or ever can, enter the kingdom of God without a divine change in the heart, and that this is the first thing in conversion to Christianity. This explains to you why I did not desire to go into a discussion with my friend upon a change of heart. I never knew a man who believed there was any such thing as induction into the kingdom of God, unless the process commenced with a change in the heart—a divine and spiritual change.

In the second place, I hold that no man was ever converted to Christianity without an essential and divine change in his character, and that no man has a right to the initiatory ordinance, that no man can avail himself of its benefits and enter into the Lord's kingdom, without a heavenly change in his character as well as in his heart. In the third place, no man ever entered the covenant who is not changed in his state. These three changes are *essential*, if you will allow me to use a very common expression. There is no entrance into the kingdom of God without a change of the heart, of the character, and of the state and relations.

But now I want to refer one moment to the process of producing these changes inductive. The question arises: "How are these changes effected in the heart?" Some one would respond, probably, "God effects them." I have no objection to that. I believe all the divine changes ever effected in the heart, are effected by God himself: that it is God who changes the heart, that he changes the feelings, that God produces the change in man. It will be said by some one, with a slight variation, however, that the divine changes are effected by the Holy Spirit. But I do not think it requires force of mind, or deep and profound reasoning ability, to perceive that this can also be true as well as the other. God produces the divine change of the heart by the Holy Spirit; the change is from God through the Holy Spirit of God. But there is still a question left open: How does God, by the Holy Spirit, effect this change of the heart? I claim that the Holy Spirit of God effects it in the heart of man, by compelling that man, by expostulating with him, by reasoning with him; that the Word of God brings the divine evidence before the mind and understanding, that the Spirit of God brings the glorious truths of Christianity—reveals the will of God to man. I say the revelation of God by his Spirit, changes the mind, changes the heart, changes the feelings, and disposes the man to submit himself to the

government of God. Now I make this brief statement, for my friend expects it. If he takes it, let him do it. It will not be necessary for me to go into any labored remarks in regard to it. If he is disposed to take issue, I want him to argue it, by taking the strongest scriptural issue he has in his power to take. Let us examine the merits of the case, sound the matter to the bottom, and if there is any heresy, let us have it out so the people can see it. Well, a change in character must precede any induction into the kingdom of God. And what is it that changes a character? Why, faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. Faith changes the feelings, it changes the heart: faith in the revelations which God has given to mankind, produces a divine change in his feelings, so that he acts right from that time forward. Here we have a divine change in his heart and character. Now, what is lacking? Why not call him a Christian now? Is it not necessary that there should be a change in the state? If a man is ready to enter into a new state, a new government, or a new kingdom, the point of change is the state. There is not a passage in the Bible, from side to side, which intimates that faith alone ever changed the state of any man; nor is there a passage which says that repentance alone ever changed his state; nor is there a passage which says that the cross of Christ, or the love of God, or calling upon

the name of the Lord, or any other one thing, ever did, or ever can of itself, change the relations, or bring a new man into the kingdom of God. I want to be a little particular on this point, so that my friend can see exactly where he will need fortification as he goes along. I know how loud, long, and strong he can argue on justification. I am aware what fine things he can say in reference to being saved by, grace and the blood of Jesus; but if I do not, during this controversy, find a place for the grace of God, and every thing else relating to the subject, and mark it out clear enough for every man to see, I shall be worse defeated than I have ever been in undertaking any question of this kind. It is not a system of salvation without Christ, nor without repentance, that we insist on. No; we want all the faith, all the religion, all the grace, and blood, and repentance, and every thing that is revealed through God in that divine process of conversion to Christianity. Now a little more in relation to the point. I want to enquire if you find any passage in the New Testament on believing into Christ? Is there any passage that speaks of repentance into Christ? No: there is no place where we read of praying into Christ; not a passage can I find where they prayed into Christ, where they repented into Christ, where they enjoyed the grace of God in Christ, or where they received the Word of God

in Christ; and no one single sentence, where all spiritual blessings were enjoyed in Christ. No single one of these items seems to be the consummating act which transplants a man from one state to another state. I recollect an expression that a very able teacher used frequently to make; it was this: "In all correct speech, you find an into, before there is an in." As an instance: we all come into this house, before any man can be said to be in this house. We all come into this world, before any of us can be said to be in this world. Every man enters into the church, before he can do any thing in the church. Now, if there is any thing self-evident, simple, plain, and within the comprehension of every man of sense, it is, that there must be an into before there is an in; and there is not a person here who ever was in any place until he first went into it. Now, the question is, how a man comes into Christ—by what act does a man enter into Christ? You can date the age of your child to an hour, because you know the precise act that introduced him from one state to another. You can date the time of your marriage, because you know the precise action that changes the relation, and which takes a person into another state; and just so, every man that has been initiated into the government in which we live, knows that there is a consummating act which endows him with the rights

of a citizen. There may be some gentleman present who may belong to that ancient association called the Masonic order; or that organization known as the Odd Fellows' order; or that still newer one, the Sons of Temperance. These mysterious orders of course we can not tell any thing about; but there is one thing evident: there is an initiatory ceremony, and with that ceremony, there is a consummating act from which we can date precisely when a man became a member. What is this initiatory ceremony? What is this consummating act? When has a man completed the process? Where is it that he enters into? Where is it that he puts on the blood of Christ? I am not going to risk any thing. I do not intend to give brother Fisher a hold on me in this discussion. I am going to argue the old process with the apostle Paul, and see how he likes it. Paul says: "For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." 1 Cor. xii. 13. There is the word *into* as broad as life, though there are only four letters in it. I suppose there can be no controversy as to what that one body was. Now, I do not want to dispute about the comparative merits of the different churches; but I unhesitatingly aver, that the one body is the Church of the Living God, and every Christian in it, every saint, and every man who is converted to the Lord Jesus Christ, is in the one body and the one church.

But how did he get into it? If Paul's testimony is to be regarded, he was baptized *into* it. They never baptized a man *in* Christ; there is no such an ordinance as this, except it be of modern date. The old ordinance was an initiatory rite and ceremony; it was inductive to the kingdom of God, and there was no such a thing as a man being baptized *in* Christ, or in his kingdom, or his body. I have heard preachers say, that Paul is here talking about Holy Ghost baptism; that it is not the initiatory rite and ordinance, and it never inducted any body into the kingdom of God. I want my opponent to show me where God ever authorized man to administer Holy Ghost baptism; and also show us how *he* would administer the ordinance. I would like for him to explain how it can be done. But this is the sacred initiatory rite which the Spirit of the Living God directs all men to perform, and be baptized into one body; and there is no entering the one body only by one Christian initiatory rite—this consummating act.

But there is another passage—John iii. This man, Nicodemus, belonging to one of the most popular churches of his generation, came to the Savior by night (which I do not like; probably he did not want his brethren to hear of it), and approached the Savior in the most respectful terms, saying: “Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do

these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." Said Jesus: "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." Now, whenever the Lord says a thing can not be done, it is no use for preachers to say it can be. "Nicodemus answered and said unto him, How can these things be? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." Now, I undertake to say, there was no controversy in the first three hundred years among the ancient Fathers about this subject. There was but one voice in the church. Born of water is baptism, and a man must pass through this, or he can not enter into the kingdom of God. If you want to be a little more particular, I will call your attention to Acts ix. Saul, on his way to Damascus, fell down, and lifted up his voice and said: "Who art thou, Lord?" And Jesus said: "A Redeemer whom thou persecutest." Then says Saul: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" And the Lord said unto him: "Arise, and go to the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." Well, he got up, went to Damascus, and a man of God was sent to him to tell him. He did not stop to explain my friend's doctrine, that baptism is not essential at all, and that a man can be pardoned before he gets into the kingdom. No! Says he: "Why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash

away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Here, "wash away thy sins," is distinctly expressive of pardon. Now, I would be pleased to hear my friend, who takes issue, say that his sins were washed away before the minister commanded him to arise and wash them away. It is his province to prove that his sins were washed away, and that he was to arise and be baptized, because his sins were washed away, and he was in the kingdom! Rom. vi. 2: "God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?" I wonder how my friend likes the expression, "baptized into Jesus Christ?" It did not say, baptized into the Baptist church, nor into any modern name under the heavens—not one of them. The old ordinance of baptism which Jesus Christ and the apostles practiced, was not the initiatory ordinance into some of the partisan churches of our time. What did you say, Paul? Why, "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death: therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Now, I should like to know what prejudice my friend can possibly have against a man who has a divine change

in his heart, a divine change in his character and feelings—a man whose heart has been changed by the love of Christ, by faith in the Redeemer? What prejudice he can have against that man being buried with Christ by baptism into death, or his being baptized into Christ—since the apostle says, “by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body”—I can not divine. I just take occasion to remark, that there is not a man in this house, nor in this town, nor government, nor on the whole footstool of God, who has any right to administer this ancient ordinance for any other purpose than to initiate a man into the family of God; and to use that ordinance as an initiatory ceremony to introduce a man into any lesser body, or any thing more circumscribed than the body of Christ—the great family and congregation of Almighty God—perverts an ordinance to a purpose for which God never intended it should be applied. In the next place, Peter says, in his address at the house of Cornelius: “To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.” This, then, shows that the remission of sins is in the name of Jesus Christ. No use for a man to talk about remission only through the name of Christ. A man, then, must come into—he must take the name of Jesus Christ upon him before there is any remission; because the

prophets and apostles, the Lord and the Holy Spirit, have borne witness that remission of sins is through and in his name. Well, now, is there no passage which tells us how we can get into the name of Jesus Christ? Is there no passage, then, I repeat, which informs us how they enter into the gate? (?) "Go ye, therefore, and disciple all nations," as I suppose the Bible Unionists are going to translate it, "baptizing them into the name." Now, I do not know whether my friend will allow me the privilege to revise, and call it into, but it is going to stand that way, and he might as well be getting ready to accept the revised version: "Baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Now, what shall we say of that great formula when we administer the baptismal ordinance? The preacher says: "I baptize you into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." What does he mean by baptizing them *into the name*? Why, it is into the family; and so soon as this is done, the name comes on him, and the family is no less than all of the saints. I have no faith in these little families. I never intend to preach a less kingdom, a less body, or a less church, than that of the Living God—the popular and spiritual church; nor will I have a more narrow and circumscribed name than the body and whole family in heaven and on earth. Let us have that name, and

then brother Fisher shall come and stand side by side, and will be in the same name and family. Will it not be a glorious time? We will not have a single man to say, "stand away," because there all have the same name, are in the same family, have the same faith and the same laws, act and abide by one gospel, have the same rights and immunities, and are of the same glorious blood of God. I tell you, brother, it fills my soul with the benevolent riches of our Lord Jesus Christ. How it spreads open the door for all good and pious thoughts. Here we find that every one who is baptized into the name have forgiveness of sins. Says one: "I believe in being cleansed by the blood of Christ." Well, I want you to hold on to that until the day of Judgment. There has not been a sin cleansed since the foundation of the world, that was not cleansed by the blood of Jesus. I am not the man to come here and depreciate the blood of the Everlasting Covenant. Not at all. I shall praise it for ever and ever. But where shall we get into the blood of the blessed Redeemer? By his name, when he was he on the tree of Calvary, when every part of his body was in pain and torture, and when the blood trickled down his face, and streamed as water from his side. It was to wash us from our sins. It was in his death that the blood was poured out for our sins. If you want to get to the blood of the Everlast-

ing Covenant, you must come to the death of Jesus. Paul says: "As many of us as have been baptized into Jesus Christ, have been baptized into his death." But, says a man, "I want to be saved by the Spirit of God." This is right. He must go where the Spirit of God is. If the religion of this world has any Holy Spirit in it, it will evince itself in a holy life. I do not want better evidence that the Holy Spirit of God dwells in a man's heart, than to see him stand square up and obey it. Well, where will he get to the Holy Spirit? Says Jesus to the disciples: "If I go to my Father, I will send you a holy Comforter, and he shall guide you into the truth." On the day of Pentecost, the Spirit of the Living God was sent down upon the Church, and it has been, and will be in the body, until the end of time. And in this sense the Lord says: "I will be with you even to the end of the world." He is the Church by his Spirit, and the Spirit of God is in the Church, and all the preachers in this government can not show a man how he can get the Spirit of God until he enters the body where the Spirit of God dwells. A man, to come to the Spirit, must enter into the body; the Holy Spirit invites all to come. But how does a man enter into the body? "By one Spirit," he says, "you are all baptized into one body." Baptizing is the initiatory rite, introducing a man,

whose heart is previously prepared, into one body. Now, I do not want any man here to get the idea into his head that we have a religion in which there is no divine change of heart or feeling in it. Such is not the fact. But it teaches, that if you want to get to the enjoyment and love of Christ, you must enter into the body.

Before my hour expires, I must get to the exact issue between my friend and myself. I want him to have it standing prominently before his eyes. How shall we make out the issue? Well, sir, the issue is simply on the question, "Whether baptism, administered as the Lord intended, to a proper subject, is for the remission of past, or alien sins?" I state it as it exists in the correspondence. He walks out on the platform and takes the position, that it is not for the remission of sins; and the little negative adverb *not*, is all the difference between us. This little word is what the dispute is about. I declare that the word *not* is an interpolation—that it ought to be stricken out. I say it is not in the Bible, but my friend intends to have it inserted, and it will stand, I expect, viz., baptism *not* for the remission of sins! I recollect when there was a debate about it once before. Do you remember a little controversy which started out at an early period of the world? When our parents were placed in the

Garden of Eden, the Lord commanded the man, saying: "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Well, old mother Eve remembered this; but some Christian preacher came along and began to offer some feasible argument; but Eve quoted the words of the law: "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Now, says the preacher, "you are mistaken; thou shalt *not* surely die." This was the controversy. The Lord left the word out, but the preacher inserted it, and that word was the basis of the condemnation of the whole world, and the fall of man to that depravity which my friend calls total, hereditary depravity.

Well, now I will look at a passage in the New Testament. He will have to come up to the day of Pentecost, when three thousand "seekers" came up to the "mourners' bench." He calls it by another name, but I did not read about any "altar of prayer." That altar is one which he has erected, or somebody else. In the old process of conversion, taught by the apostles, there is no such thing as that to pass in order to get into the Covenant. Three thousand inquirers called out: "Men and brethren, what shall we do to be saved?" We want brother Fisher to wake up and give an answer

to the Holy Ghost, without any prevarication or interpolation, and I wish him to go as straight as a line, for several gentlemen of the Bible Union are watching us. There is no dodging about it—he must come up and answer the Holy Ghost in terms as simple as our language affords. What did the Holy Spirit say to these seekers? “Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.” Had brother Fisher been there, he would have exhorted them: “O! come up to the mourners’ bench, every one of you, and we will pray for you!” I claim a wide difference between my opponent and myself. I believe the precise language of the Spirit of God, and he is here to deny it. He wants to insert the little adverb *not*—“Repent and be baptized, *not* for the remission of sins.” I would not insert that word for the country; nay, I would not do it for worlds upon worlds! If any thing is evident, the language of the apostle to inquirers desiring to know the way, is the truth of this I have appeared here before this intelligent audience to discuss and defend. What do you think of the interpolation? Shall we insert the word *not*? If you receive my friend’s version, you must let it appear thus: “Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *not* for the remission

of sins." O! what a translation! Do you think the Bible Union will help you out with that, or any wrong translation beneath the shining skies? No, she will not. Why does he not stand upon a firm platform? Why not go straightforward and preach the word of the Living God without equivocation, without hesitation? Whether I know the meaning of the proposition or not, it is in the exact language of the Bible, and if he changes one, he must also change the other. But suppose he says it has some other meaning? He never intimated to me that there was any thing dubious about the language. Why not? Because the words of the proposition are as clear and intelligible as language can possibly describe any thing; and if the words in the proposition are clear and intelligible, why, then, sir, the language of the proof-text, which I apply to it, is also clear, explicit, and intelligible, because it is in identically the same language. If one has a dangerous doctrine in it, the other is not true, because they are alike.

Now to the last commission. I will take Mark's record of it: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." Now, if I understand this passage, there are two conditions to reach one object; but that

does not prove that there are no other conditions. There may be others, but I defy the ingenuity of any man in this world to get rid of either of the two conditions contained in the passage. He that does these two things shall be saved (the word saved is here used in the sense of justify), shall receive forgiveness of sins, and shall receive induction into the kingdom of God. Belief, of itself, will not save a man: he must be baptized if he would come to the justification, which is through the blood of the Covenant. Here you discover that the Lord had this doctrine in his eye. "Go ye, therefore," says Mathew, "and disciple all nations, baptizing them into the name." Well, into the name is into a state of justification, which is just equivalent to the other—"Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Here you find precisely the same doctrine again. But let me call your attention for a moment to Peter's discourse in Solomon's portico. He preached Christ, and when a man believed on him, he went on to show him the kingdom of God. He preached thus, and a large number of his audience were convinced. He turns to address them: "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted." Here is repentance; and no man ever repented without faith, because repentance is well pleasing to

God; and the apostle says, "without faith, it is impossible to please God." He that cometh to God must believe. It is faith in our Lord Jesus Christ which changes the heart and the feelings; it is the revelation of God which imbues the love of God in the soul, that leads a man to repentance. "Repent and be converted." What for? That your sins may be blotted out. [*Time expired.*]

FRIDAY, JUNE 5, 11 o'clock A. M.

[MR. FISHER'S FIRST REPLY.]

Brother Moderators:

From the correspondence between my opponent and myself, you will perceive that there are two bills of indictment, which are preferred against me. I am charged, in the first bill, with having been in the town of Ghent, holding a meeting, at which time I made serious assaults upon the Disciples, out of which has grown the present discussion. I deny the charge in the first bill of indictment, and challenge the specifications and the proof. In the second bill of indictment, I am to be hung for a lamb, or an old sheep; for my friend says: "You are now in for a debate, and you had as well be hung for an old sheep as a lamb." I thank my opponent for admitting, that if I am hung, the

world will see that it is for a lamb or a sheep, and not for a goat! I presume that he intended the lamb or sheep to personify truth, and the opposite of a sheep is a goat, which means error.

My opponent stated, if you recollect, in the commencement of his argument, which he gave us before he stated his proposition, in the first place, his belief in a divine change of heart before baptism; in the second place, a change of character; and in the third place, a change of state. These qualifications are essentially necessary in order to enter the kingdom. Not one of these constituent elements of essentiality, can, under any circumstances, be dispensed with. If this is the case, it does not require a logician to prove that even though a man may have undergone a change of heart, of character, of feeling, yet without a change of state, which he says, is effected by baptism, he may still go to hell! Now, you see in what an awful dilemma my opponent involves nine-tenths of the professedly Christian world. Mr. Campbell will doubtless be good authority upon this subject. He says, that "no essential can be dispensed with." Then baptism is just as essential as a divine change of heart, as essential as a divine change of feeling. If, without this change of state, the man is lost, is it not at war with Bible examples? Does he not join issue with the Son of God? Does he not confine the remission of

sins and the salvation of the soul to a mere bodily act? Under some circumstances baptism can not be performed; a physical impossibility is in the way—then the individual dying, must be lost; for baptism is just as essential as a change of heart, or of feeling. “*Ho, procul, procul este profani.*”

After my opponent, in an incoherent manner, argued this position, he then stated his first proposition, and in the latter part of his argument, he reminded me very much of a squirrel a great way from home, jumping from limb to limb—falling and clambering desperately until he effected his retreat.

I was very glad that my opponent brought forward the initiatory rite of the Masonic fraternity as analogically illustrative of the manner in which an individual is inducted into the kingdom of our blessed Redeemer. I wish my opponent was a member of that ancient and honorable order; if so, he would not have instanced this case to prove his proposition. He refers to the third chapter of John. Nicodemus, like my opponent, was an inquirer after truth, and I hope he, my opponent, may be as fortunate in finding it, before this debate closes. I profess to have found it; I am not, therefore, in search of it. I have been challenged to defend it, and will, the God of Heaven being my helper, upon this occasion. The Savior

said to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Then, born to see, and born to enter, must be synonymous terms. And here my opponent takes the ground, that born of water is baptism. Pray, sir, as a scholar and a critic, what is the original word for born of water? It can not be *baptizo*. I know very little about Greek, or any thing save my Bible, and I have studied by candle-light, by day-light, and brush-light; but I never read where born of water was baptism. Scholars differ as to the meaning of this phrase. Now, sir, if born of water means baptism, whose baptism was it, John's or Christ's? My opponent says, that baptism is indispensably necessary to secure an entrance into the kingdom of God. He doubtless knows whose and what baptism this is; and I would pause here in the commencement of my argument, and allow him to tell the audience whose baptism it is, but I fear he has not the nerve to do it; though he gets up here and boldly declares, that born of water is baptism in this instance; and then, after having dwelt upon John iii. 5, he goes to the conversion of Paul, and abstracts a passage from the Word of God to prove that baptism means the washing away of sins! Does washing there have any allusion to baptism? Is *baptizo* any where within the lids of this book translated *washing*?

Will the revisers so translate it? As he has mentioned this abstract passage, which he has wrenched from its primeval connection with the context, let me analyze it in its abstract form. And I intend, before this discussion closes, to show you that baptism had nothing to do in Paul's conversion. Arise was the first act Paul was commanded to perform, the second was to be baptized, and the third was to wash away his sins. Now, the washing away of sins was not, in Paul's case, an act of baptism; neither was the remission of sins such an act: that was one act, the washing away of sins was another, and calling upon the name of the Lord was the last. My opponent attempted to soar aloft, and, like the eagle, or condor, visit the sun; but the bright beams of truth blinded him, and he came whirling, fluttering, and crippled, back, lighting on the second chapter and 38th verse of the Acts of the Apostles, and there plants his standard, unfurls his banner, and puts words into my mouth which I never said nor never intend to say in connection with the circumstance contained in Acts ii. 38.

Having made these remarks in relation to what my opponent would term his *argument* (though I would say his first *speech*, for in my humble judgment it would require a Philadelphia lawyer to tell whether it was an argument or not), I will now to the law and testimony.

Although I am a Bible and a Revision man, I shall not quote from the revised edition of King James until I get it in my possession. I do not know how they will translate *eis*, whether in, or into, as learned men differ in relation to the signification of that term. If they translate it *in*, be it so; if *into*, I will, with all my heart, subscribe to it. My friend, in quoting from a book which is in the womb of futurity—which has not been born into this world—will find it a heavy burden before this debate closes: it may prove too much for him, and greatly benefit the cause of truth. In Hebrews ix. 22, we read: “And without shedding of blood is no remission.” Again, in Mat. xxvi. 28: “For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.” This is the language of the Holy Spirit. If the blood of Jesus Christ is for the remission of sins, it does not require a dialectician to prove that baptism is not. Will my opponent take the ground, that the blood of Christ is a symbol of water baptism, or that baptism symbolizes the blood of Christ? or will he not take the Bible ground, that the blood of Christ is for the actual remission of sins, and that baptism is the symbol of remission? I affirm, that in no place within the lids of the Bible is it stated that baptism is for the actual remission of sins; but it is stated, as the foregoing quota-

tions prove, that the blood of Jesus Christ is for the actual remission of sins. Which horn of the dilemma will my opponent take—will he make water symbolical of the blood of Christ, or will he make the blood of Christ symbolical of water? Now, let us look at the truth of God in relation to this matter—let us look it, my dear sir, “full in the face, and let us come squarely up to it,” and look at the spirit of the teachings of John, and Peter, and Jesus, and see if they harmonize. John preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. Mark i. 4. Did he baptize the people in order to bring them to repentance, or did he baptize them because they had brought forth fruits meet, declarative of their repentance for the remission of their sins? Upon the day of Pentecost Peter preached the very same baptism of repentance that John preached: and were they baptized upon the day of Pentecost in order to produce repentance? No: but because they *had* repented. I wonder if a man rejoices and is sorrowful at the same time? Can it be possible that one can be happy with a broken heart? I say that it is as morally impossible as for these two pitchers to inhabit the same space at the same time. Now, is it not positively said in the second chapter of Acts, that “they that gladly received the word and were baptized?” In the 38th verse we have sorrow, in the 41st

we have joy—repentance in the 38th, and gladness in the 41st verse; and all these before baptism. He seems to be particularly fond of the word *for*, and desirous that I should metamorphose a preposition into a conjunction. But my opponent will see that I believe what Peter preached. Now, turn to a passage in Mark, first chapter and 40th verse, where Christ cleansed the leper. After he was cleansed, Jesus said to him, “See thou say nothing to any man; but go thy way, show thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing those things which Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.” Was not the man cleansed before he made the offering for his cleansing? Did not John baptize with the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, after they had repented? Did not Peter baptize as John did? Yes: as the leper was cleansed before he made his offering for his cleansing, so were those converts, upon the day of Pentecost, cleansed before they were baptized; and so it was with the disciples of John the Baptist. Now, why is it that my opponent will not interpret baptism here for a declarative remission of sins? Under the unsullied heavens, and in sight of the angels who throng the thrones and spheres of eternity, and in the presence of men and devils, we declare, when we are baptized, that our sins have been remitted by faith in the

blood of Jesus Christ. We have repentance toward God, and faith in the atoning mercies of the blessed Savior.

There is a little more I want to say on this subject. I am so full of it I hardly know where to stop. I have been praying to God that I may be filled with the spirit of my mission upon this occasion, and that I may defend the truth, for this truth is to descend upon the revolving waves of time to the latest posterity. It is to be in the hands of the million, and the eyes of the world are to gaze upon it. My opponent turned to Acts iii. You will recollect that Peter and John entered the temple at the hour of prayer, which was three o'clock in the afternoon. Sitting at the beautiful gate of Solomon's temple is an old cripple. Peter and John fastened their eyes upon him; they knew that he expected some alms. But, said Peter, "Silver and gold I have none. We are poor men like yourself; we have no scrip, no purse; we have taken our lives in our hands at the bidding of the Son of God, who has commanded us to go and preach repentance and remission of sins in His name, among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, rise up and walk." A miracle was performed. The old cripple not only walked, but he leaped for joy. Now the Jews turn upon John and Peter for having performed a miracle in attestation of

their apostleship, and the fact that they had received the divine appointment from Jesus Christ. Peter tells the Jews, in the afternoon of the day of Pentecost (as he did in the forenoon), how they had taken by wicked hands and crucified the Lord of life and glory; that it was through faith in the name of this Jesus, whom you Jews have wantonly murdered, that this man who stands before you was made whole. In his exhortation to them, he says: "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." Mr. Campbell has metamorphosed conversion here into baptism, and my opponent has adopted this offspring of Father Campbell. Permit me to say, that neither Mr. Campbell nor my opponent shall define terms for me. If Mr. Campbell has published a lexicon, I have not seen it, only as he has given it in his first extra *Millennial Harbinger*, upon remission of sins; and, if my opponent has published a nomenclature, I should like to see whether the works of these two individuals correspond with the works of Webster and Walker. These are the received standards of orthography and orthoepy in our literary institutions, or some of them at least. Walker says, "to repent is to think on any thing past with sorrow; to express sorrow for something past." Then the man will be truly sorry

for having been baptized according to this definition. Mr. Campbell and my opponent can not get around it. Now, sir, will you hear the winding up of this whole matter from the lips of inspired truth, from a man overflowing with the Holy Spirit, with a countenance bright with the sunbeams of immortality? Hear what he says. But first let me give you Walker's definition of convert, and see how beautifully it harmonizes with Peter's. Convert means to change, to change one sentiment for another, one opinion for another. My opponent may change his *opinions* for my *truths*, or for Bible truths, before this debate ends; and instead of being a disciple of the current reformation, he may be a disciple of our blessed Savior, and preach repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Peter says to these Jews, "Repent and be converted"—that is, change your Jewish ways, and show to the world that you are converts to Christianity. Peter says, Acts iv. 3: "Howbeit, many of them which heard the word, believed, and the number of the men was about five thousand." Now, here we have three thousand in the first, and five thousand in the second. Acts x. 43, is based upon what Peter said in the fourth chapter and fourth verse of the same book: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him, shall receive remission of sins." Did not

the three thousand believe in Jesus of Nazareth? Did not the five thousand also believe? Peter says that all the prophets bear witness that in the name of Jesus Christ, through faith, whosoever believeth shall receive remission of sins. The prophets threw the radiant beams of their united light around him—they wreathed laurels of imperishable beauty around him. As the sheaves of Joseph's brethren bowed down to the sheaf of Joseph, so we bow to Jesus of Nazareth, who has inspired his prophets to say, that whosoever believeth in him shall have remission of sins. Is it true or false?

My time has almost expired, but I will not hurry. I will give you "*multum in parvo.*" I will press a world of thought in a nutshell of truth. This people, and the whole world, should know the truth, and receive the truth, if they would free themselves from the shackles and the thralldom of Satan. When my opponent answers the interrogatories which I proposed in relation to John iii. 5, then I will give you an exegesis upon that verse, which will present his system in a most ridiculous attitude, and I think he will return to Cincinnati ashamed of having declared, that born of water means baptism. This is his interpretation of the matter. [*Time expired.*]

FRIDAY EVENING, 2½ o'clock.

[SECOND ADDRESS OF MR. FRANKLIN.]

I feel, Ladies and Gentlemen, under many obligations to my worthy friend, for his liberality in granting me three minutes' time. I could but feel, however, that he was generous beyond his ability. I think he needed those three minutes; but perhaps the audience do not think with me.

I want to make a slight reference in relation to the two indictments of the gentleman; and in doing so, I would simply observe, that they are not in the bill at all. These indictments were simply in the correspondence, which we are not debating here. As to the statements I made in the correspondence, I will risk their standing good in the estimation of this community, without debating them here. I do not intend to waste my time with personal allusions, such as were made by my friend in the outset of his speech. I am not afraid of such remarks upon the intelligence of this audience. But, leaving all that, I shall pass to notice the principal points in the speech.

The first trouble my friend fell into, was the old, long-hackneyed, labored, and oft-repeated lamentation, that if the doctrine we hold be true, so many will sink down to bottomless

perdition. I understand all that as clearly as I understand any thing; and the first observation in reference to it, is the fact that it is in direct violation of one of the clearest rules of honorable controversy, which forbids binding a consequence upon a disputant, which he has not avowed. I did not grant to my friend the privilege to state the consequence of any doctrine which is proved to be true. Now, the simple question in discussion is not, how many will be lost who are not baptized, or how many will be saved in heaven, or how few. This is a question which neither of us could think of deciding. It has nothing to do with the legitimate question, which is, Whether baptism of a proper subject is for the remission of past sins? Now, if he had ever received the proper instruction in relation to the facts of the issue, it would have saved him from some lofty flights, and from some tearing digressions, which he made in his last speech. I want to state his consequence, and take one more look at it, for, God knows, I have no fear to face any thing that he has said or can say in this discussion. I will try to state it in as plain and forcible language as possible. It is this: "I admit that the sinner must have a divine change of heart, and he must also have a genuine, deep, and solemn repentance, before he is fit to be baptized." Now, he says: "Suppose a man has this divine

change of heart, and this pungent, deep, and full repentance for his sins, and dies before baptism, he sends him down to hell!" Was there any person in this room who saw any thing in all that I said, which intimated my belief in such a doctrine? I quoted the explicit word of God, to show how a man enters into Christ, and how a man obtains forgiveness of sins. Where did he get this strange proposition of his? Why, it is one of his own deductions—it is one of his own inferences. I made no such statement. And if, in showing clearly how a man enters into the kingdom of God, how he can obtain forgiveness of sins, what he must do to obtain remission of sins, I am not responsible for the deductions which his fertile imagination may draw. But I am not quite done with his position yet. He says: "If this doctrine is true, then a man's hope of heaven depends upon the personal and external action of an individual." Well, now, what has he to say about a man who does not believe? Is he afraid to quote the words of the New Testament concerning this? What! believe in the personal act or acts of a creature? What a lamentable doctrine! He would teach that a man would be damned simply because he did not perform a mere act of a creature!! There are a great many ways of stating a thing for the purpose of public effect. Suppose a man comes

up, looks at the divine testimony, and declares he will not believe it—is that to be set aside by the worthless expression or a mere act of a creature? Can a man disregard the testimony of Almighty God, and the blood of the Everlasting Covenant, declaring that he disregards it, and that he will not yield to it? Can a man do thus and be saved? Suppose that a man comes up, looks at baptism, and declares that it is an external performance—that it is nothing but a religious rite. Then put the question home to his heart: Did not Almighty God command it; and if he commanded it, is it not right that he should be obeyed? Does not every man here know that it is right; and if every man knows it is right, can any man expect to be saved, who will not do what he knows to be right? If a man disobeys what he knows to be the command of God, he sets aside the authority of the Infinite One. But it is not, then, simply, a mere external performance which creates the offence, but the disrespect to, and rebellion against, authority, which will send the man down to perdition, if he persists in refusing to submit to the government of the great God. But my friend kindly informs the audience that baptism is impossible under some circumstances! Now, I hope the gentleman will try and bear it, for I will be as easy on him as I possibly can. He has the boldness to

insist that baptism is impossible under some circumstances! I am willing he should state it himself, for I want to take him just as he is. Baptism impossible! Why, that is the old song which the opposers of immersion have been singing all over the country. He positively, in his speech, has gone over on the side of the Pedobaptists, and is now putting difficulty in the way of baptism, and speaking of it as an impossibility! I will tell you, brethren, one thing—I will venture that brothers Helm and Fisher never yet found a fit subject for baptism without finding water to baptize him in, and doing so irrespective of consequences. No danger of their ever getting off on to sprinkling. There is no place on the habitable globe where the ordinance of baptism is impossible, where it can not be administered to every one who has faith in the Redeemer. But, granting him all that he can ask, I want to try him on this one thing of making baptism conditional, and depending on the act of a creature. Well, do you know how a man is to act? Paul says: “Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God;” and then he asks the question: “How shall they hear without a preacher?” So that it is an act to preach the Word of God to a man that he may hear it. And will you turn around and reply to the Word of God, “He that believeth not,” &c.? Can a man’s

salvation depend on a good preacher? Is it possible that a poor, finite creature, must preach the Word of God, and that we must believe it? Can the action of an insignificant mortal be the means of sinking a man down to perdition for ever? There are some tremendous responsibilities on the hands of creatures who do not believe. My Bible shows no reason for damning any man in the world, unless it be for the omission of certain actions which God has required, or in the commission of certain crimes which he has inhibited. The only reason is, there is a want of action, or the performance of improper actions. Let no man, then, get up here and talk about the mere action of a creature, as though the *action* was simply a matter of reason. Why, a man is damned because he acts badly, wickedly, and corruptly; and every good man is recognized as such, because he acts righteously and correctly. The action is but the exponent of the heart, and if a man acts upright and piously, it is because he has a pious and upright heart.

I was amused at my friend undertaking, with his very labored instruction, to enlighten my benighted mind in regard to Masonry. I heard a venerable gentleman here, say that he did not understand distinctly what he was talking about. All here know, whether connected with the order or not, that no man is entitled to the

rights, privileges, and immunities of Masonry, until he is initiated—until the last act, the finishing touch, has been applied: then he is a Mason. But, says my friend, “he is a Mason in heart.” Yes, so he is, just as much as that man who has been attentively listening to the gospel is going *toward* Christianity. His heart is becoming right; he then changes in his actions, and conducts himself properly. And then, sir, the next move is to take the initiatory step, and enter into Christianity, become a Christian in his character, and a Christian in his relations. The cases are exactly similar. How do persons enter the marriage covenant? The first thing is, to produce the proper state of heart, which is done by acquaintance. Acquaintance gains the heart, and feelings, and the affections. What young man here would stand up and claim that he was positively in the married covenant, and had never gone through the marriage ceremony? Suppose a gentleman who had made every preparation to enter into the marital relation, should, with his betrothed, stand before brother Fisher, and would say, “Brother Fisher, I can’t give you five dollars; I believe I have as good a right in the marriage covenant as any man; as to the ceremony, I disregard it; it is not essential.” [Laughter.] Why, brother Fisher would turn around and laugh at him, and say, “You have

no authority to claim the lady as your conjugal companion, until you have passed through the legal ceremony; you must comply with the initiatory act, by the popular and ordinary means of initiation."

I would here remark, that my friend used one expression, which, I think, was in direct violation of one of our rules of discussion. He stood up and told us that he was not in search of truth! Well, I wonder what the word investigation means? Was it our province to come here and say, "I know all about it; I am right, I am infallible, and you are wrong?" I say, is this the province of disputants? Is not this in violation of one of the rules to which we this morning affixed our names? But he stands up here in his first speech, and declares that he is not in search of truth; he is not aiming for it, for, sir, he claims that he *is* right! I should like to know in what he is right? Has he brought forward a truth in regard to the proposition of initiation into the kingdom of God? There is not a living man in this house who can describe any plans he set forth, by which a man can enter into the kingdom of God. He has no definite mark by which he may determine when a man enters into the kingdom. No, sir, he has not given us one ray of light on the subject. While he was making his speech, I was thinking, that if the Bible did not exist,

how I should ever learn the truth of induction from him. If he did explain it, I was too obtuse to discover—I was entirely too limited in my perceptive powers to discern it. He says I put words into his mouth which he never uttered. Did he not, in the roundest terms, state that I believe baptism is for the remission of sins, and that he believed it was *not* for remission? Certainly, he put that word in. If he will strike it out, and acknowledge it to be an interpolation—that it does injustice to the language of the apostle to insert it—if he does this, then all controversy between us on this proposition is at an end. The language of the Bible is: “Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” This I believe with all my heart, in the roundest, the clearest, and the fullest manner in which it can be received and endorsed. Then my friend comes up with a new version. I beg leave to know a little about his new version, though I do not know what that “exegesis” will be. What is his explanation of Acts ii. 38? He says it is in the declarative sense. What does it declare? Why, “Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, and declare that your sins are pardoned.” To repent, is to declare something which takes place before you re-

pented. He says repentance is sorrow. Then, to repent is to declare that you are sorry for being pardoned!! This is the first time I ever heard a preacher hold up the idea that a man ought to repent, and declare that he is pardoned before he repents. What, God pardon a man in impenitence? One who is not sorry for his sins, to call upon him and declare that he is pardoned? A greater absurdity than that was never heard by mortal man!

Mr. Fisher. I wish, sir, to correct you. Did I make, in the hearing of this audience, the statement, that a man was pardoned before he repented? I made no such statement, and appeal to the Chair.

Mr. Franklin. If he wishes to reverse it, I am perfectly willing. It will then stand: "Repent and be baptized in order to obtain pardon"—just what I think it means.

Mr. Fisher. Did I not positively say that repentance was toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, as evidences of remission of sins before baptism; and that baptism was declarative of what we received in faith and repentance?

Mr. Franklin. There are but two ways about it. Either remission of sins takes place before baptism, or baptism before remission of sins. I am willing that the gentleman shall please himself. There is but one easy position he can

take during this controversy, and that is, to come right out and stand with Paul. If to repent and be baptized is for the remission of sins, why, then, let remission of sins stand after baptism. If he undertakes to put remission of sins previous to the utterance of Peter, that is, before baptism, he attempts to put in the record what does not exist. Several passages of Scripture, to which I have called attention, have gone unnoticed. He went off into a dissertation about the leper, and purifying into the law, subjects which do not relate to the question at all; but to a plain, clear, and unequivocal statement from the New Testament, he gave no respect whatever. For instance, to the first passage I started out upon, "By one Spirit you are all baptized into one body," he paid no attention—did not even intimate that he knew there was such a passage in the Bible. I quoted these passages for the purpose of showing that baptism is the initiatory rite, that it is into the kingdom of God, that it is the consummating act, an external act which a man performs before the world when he enters into the kingdom of Jesus Christ. No attention did he pay to these passages.

But another passage I desire to refresh in his memory, viz., Rom. vi. 1, 2, 3: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall

we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?" I quoted this passage to show that we are baptized, not into the body, but into the Church of Christ. I quoted it again, to show that baptism brings us into the death of Christ, and consequently to the blood of Jesus. Baptism brings us into the kingdom, it brings us to the blood of the Covenant, it brings us to the Life and the Spirit, and to the blood of Jesus, and washes away all sin. Now, if my friend intends to discuss this subject at all, I insist upon it that he take hold of this passage, and tell us what the meaning of baptism into Christ is. Is it not into a justified state, into a state of forgiveness—is it not into the church, into the kingdom—is it not into the body, privileges, and immunities of the house of God, and the forgiveness of sin? In passing along, however, I want to notice another passage, the third chapter of John: "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." Now, the word *see* is used in the sense of enjoy—Except a man be born again, he can not enjoy the kingdom of God. Now, the passage simply asserts, that a man must be born again to enjoy the kingdom of God, but does not explain what being born again means. The Lord responds to the inquiries of Nicodemus: "Verily, except

a man be born of water, and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." My friend questions that born of water means baptism—roundly, boldly, and deliberately questions that it means baptism. He says it is not the Greek word *baptizo*. Who, in the name of reason, ever heard of such a thing? Born of water is a figurative reference to baptism; and I claim that the ancient Fathers all agree in regard to that very passage. It is quoted in the standard works in the Baptist libraries, and applied to baptism. It is quoted in the standard works of Presbyterians, of Episcopalians, and of Methodists, and there applied to baptism. Is he to stand up here and oppose the most learned men who have quoted that passage, and say it means something else? [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FISHER'S SECOND REPLY.]

Brethren Moderators:

My opponent is opposed to being held responsible for consequences. Very well. "If baptism is for the remission of sins, it does not matter whether your sins are remitted or not, for I will not be responsible for consequences." Not responsible for consequences! I think it is a fearful thing for a man to teach error. Will not God hold him responsible for the con-

sequences of erroneous teachings? Then, why does he preach remission of sins as a consequence of being baptized, if he is not to be held responsible for consequences? He presents himself at one time as responsible for consequences; and, at another, when he is reined up to the point, "O, I am not responsible for consequences." Now, my beloved friends, you see this is a predicament—a dilemma, from which he is not able to extricate himself in half an hour's struggle. He reminds me of a man in a hornet's nest, who does not know where to strike effectively. My friend sometimes strikes before him, sometimes behind, on each side, and in his frantic efforts, strikes himself as often as any thing else. He is like Capt. Carter, of the steamboat *Diana*, he must run the lick, or tie up to the bank. [A laugh.] The fact is, he has traveled over the very same ground he did in his first speech. He goes to Acts ii. 38, and John iii. 5, but turns so repeatedly from one thing to another, that it is impossible for us to understand what the man is after. Now, did he not say, in the first place, that there must be a divine change of heart; second, a divine change of character, and a change of state, which is effected by baptism? In reply, I say, that his system confines Almighty God to three things, which are equally essential, namely, a change of heart, a change of character, and a

change of state: all of which are indispensable. A man may possess a divine change of heart, an altered character, and is not baptized—they profit him nothing: he is for ever lost. Now, sirs, if my friend can dispense with one essential in his triune proposition, he can dispense with them all. If he can dispense with baptism in order to get individuals into the kingdom of heaven, he can omit a change of heart, he can dispense with a change of character. Every one can see that this is a plain logical deduction from his premises. Is it not a principle in logic, as well as mathematics, that things which are equal to one another are equal to the same thing. I will illustrate this matter so clearly that the audience can not misunderstand me. Here is a man who is sick, and Mr. Franklin officiates as his physician. He administers to him the first dose of medicine, which may represent a change of heart. The man feels somewhat better. He then administers the second dose, significant of a change of character. The man improves, but has not recovered; and if he fails to take the third dose, which is baptism for remission of sins, or change of state, what is the consequence? Why, the man dies and goes to perdition—the other two doses only made him a *little* better. You can not get around this consequence. I would ask my friend, if the administrator of the ordinance of baptism has

any thing to do in helping God produce this change of character; and if so, as baptism is a bodily act, might not the supervision of a physical disability render it impossible for my friend to administer this essential, sin-remitting ordinance? Is the man to be for ever lost, because Christ has bound himself to this law of baptismal remission, an ordinance which Mr. Franklin is physically unable to apply? Do you not see into what a dilemma this absurd doctrine involves immortal souls? There is not in the illimitable empire of eternal truth, the shadow of a basis upon which he could found such a hypothetical anomaly.

My opponent, in bringing forward the case of Masonry, cites the saying of some "venerable man" to disprove my position. I know not to whom he referred. He may have been made a Mason by a different process from that by which I was, or he may be a clandestine Mason. Previous to connecting myself with the order, *I was a Mason in heart*; and, to enjoy the rights, privileges, and immunities of the lodge, I had to be initiated. Is not this the very doctrine for which I contend? Is not this analagous to what I have often preached here? When a man becomes a Christian in heart, his sins are remitted; but in order to enjoy the immunities and privileges of a church member, he has to be baptized, and he can only secure the fellow-

ship of the Church, and be entitled to partake of the memorials of the Savior's broken body and shed blood, by being baptized, and not before. This is the doctrine for which all orthodox Christians have contended from the days of the apostles to the present time.

Will my friend turn to Acts ii. 38, where he misrepresented me, and in which palpable misrepresentation he still persisted, even after I had corrected him, and had proven most conclusively, from the unerring lips of Divinity, that a man who had thoroughly repented was in possession of newness of life, which is equivalent to remission of sins. Did I not quote Acts x. 43—"To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins"? In answer to which, my opponent tries to leave the impression upon your minds that I said they were to have remission of sins before they had repented. I deny the allegation. The readers of this debate will clearly see that it was nothing more than a sophism, or *petitio principii*—a begging of the question upon the part of my opponent. I asked my opponent, in my first speech, if he would tell me whose baptism was meant in John iii. 5. Has he answered that question yet? Did I offer any particular criticism upon "being born"? It was upon the phrase "wash away thy sins," where I gave the

Greek word *louo*, wash, and showed that Paul was commanded to wash away his own sins, and that *louo* and *baptidzo* were two Greek terms expressive of two different actions. But I am sorry to see a disposition upon the part of my opponent to cavil, and his inability to produce any new arguments. In common parlance, I fear my friend is out of soap; but if not now, he will exhaust his scanty supply before this discussion ends, if he will go it with me, shoulder to shoulder, from day to day.

Having made these remarks in answer to my friend's speech, I now, in the presence of this assembly, ask my friend a question, to which I have a right to demand a categorical answer: If born of water is baptism, whose baptism is it? You see he has not, and can not answer this question. He says he calls my attention a second time to Romans vi. Well, I will relieve him of the painful necessity of calling my attention to it a third time. "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For

if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin." Rom. vi. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. From these verses we learn that Christ died for our sins, that he was buried, and that he arose again. The believer in Christ is dead to sin, and he that is dead to sin is freed from sin. Talk about baptizing a man for the remission of sins, who is dead to sin, and freed from sin. As Christ was buried in the tomb of Joseph, so the believer who is dead to sin, is buried in the baptismal grave. As Christ arose again for our justification, so the justified believer rises from the grave of baptism to walk in newness of life. "The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." 1 Peter iii. 21. The first point I shall prove is, that believers are dead to, and freed from, sin; second, that baptism is not for the remission of the sins of a believer in Christ who has a good conscience. "No man without a pardon of sin has a good conscience." Baptism does not make the conscience good, but is the act resulting from a good conscience; therefore,

baptism is not for the remission of sins. Now, sir, there is in my friend's way a cloud-touching pyramid of truth, which can not be overturned. A great deal of what I said he ascribed to my fruitful imagination. I thank God for not having left me entirely destitute of what Wordsworth calls

——— the glorious faculty assigned
 To elevate the more than reasoning mind,
 And color life's dark cloud with orient rays.
 Imagination is that sacred power—
 Imagination, lofty and refined.

But even with an imagination as prolific as that which my friend mordaciously accords to me, I could not, though my existence depended upon it, imagine my sins to be remitted before they were forgiven! The fact is, my friend does not, in every respect, believe the system which he with such magniloquence attempts to advocate: for though he baptizes people for the remission of their sins, yet he will at the same time receive into his fellowship those who have never been so baptized! Have not I a venerable and illustrious example of this inconsistency, in the person of one of the moderators upon this occasion? Was not my venerable brother here baptized upon a profession of faith, and if he has ever been re-baptized for the remission of his sins, I have never heard of it. He has full fellowship with all the Disciples in Kentucky.

So baptism is not always for the remission of sins, according to the practice of our friends of the reformation. My opponent wished to impress upon your minds, that I believed baptism was a non-essential. "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth!" A non-essential! When, I ask, did I affirm, or even intimate, such a thing? When, in relation to baptism being for the remission of sins, I disavowed my belief in such a doctrine, were we discussing the action or design of baptism? Do I not believe immersion is the action which God requires, and do I not immerse and receive individuals into the church upon a profession of their faith? Most assuredly I believe that it is the duty of every proper subject for the ordinance, to be baptized. It has been made obligatory by the example of Jesus, and, as I have shown, is the answer of a good conscience, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the grave. My friend hinted something in relation to the conversion of Paul, but he played rather upon the phrase, "be baptized and wash away thy sins." Now, I will prove, that nothing beneath the shining heavens is more false than the position which my opponent has assumed in relation to the conversion of Paul, and the forgiveness and pardon of sins before baptism. Well, now to the law and testimony, which is to be found in Acts ix. 1, 2. In this chapter Luke gives a graphic account

of the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. In the first and second verses we find him a persecutor. He traveled to Damascus, and on the way he fell to the earth, and a voice spoke to him, saying, "Why persecutest thou me?" Saul asks, "Who art thou, Lord?" Jesus tells him to go into the city, where he would learn the nature of his mission. He was in Damascus three days, without sight, food, and water. Ananias, in a vision, was told to go to the house of Judas and inquire for Saul. Listen, ye Disciples of the nineteenth century—listen, my worthy and learned opponent—"for behold he prayeth." Was this before baptism? [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FRANKLIN'S THIRD ADDRESS.]

I feel somewhat encouraged, as my friend has at last worked his time out. I must briefly notice some few items in the last speech, before I introduce any thing further. The first point to which I want to call your attention, is what has been said in reference to the consequence doctrine. There is such a long way between the premises and conclusion of my friend, I do not see how a man is to get them together. He says, "I admit that a man must believe, that he must repent of his sins, and that he must be baptized." Now, here are three conditions in order to obtain

pardon—first, faith; second, repentance; and third, baptism. Now, what is the deduction? Why, if a man does without the last condition, he goes to hell! Was I saying any thing about going to hell? We are arguing simply the question of the conditions of pardon. I undertake to find three conditions of pardon, viz., faith, repentance, and baptism. A man believes, he repents, but is not baptized. What is a fair and honorable deduction? He might say he is not pardoned. When I say there are three conditions of admission into the kingdom of God, viz., faith, repentance, and baptism, he may say, “What if a man stop at repentance, and is not baptized?” The deduction is, that he is not in the kingdom. When I say there are three conditions in the Church, if he stops short of the three conditions, he might make the deduction that he is not in the Church; but he makes deductions which are not in the premises. The question is not about the conditions of entering into heaven, for some of these conditions, I fear, we, brethren, do not always comply with. There are a great many more than these three, but these, I claim, are unequivocal conditions of admission into the kingdom, into the church, and into the covenant. These are the conditions upon which forgiveness of sins is obtained. Now, he turns around and reasons against it, as if it were my position.

Have I not quoted to him the passage, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved"? Does not the Lord, in this language, make belief and baptism conditions of salvation? He reasons against Jesus, and if he had stood before the Redeemer, he would have contended, Master, this doctrine will never do—do you not see the awful consequences which would result were it true? He that is not baptized, will be lost. But I will not detain you further with these statements.

I must notice the gentleman's explanation about the Masons, a better one than which I do not want. A man comes to brother Fisher, and asks to be granted the rights and privileges of Masonry, "for," says he, "I am a Mason in heart." "That may be true," says brother Fisher, "but it is absolutely essential that you should pass through the initiatory ceremonies before you can lay any claim to the privileges of the order." Just so, a man may be a Christian in heart, and, by faith in Jesus Christ, may be changed, and love the Redeemer, hating sin; but the best evidence of this is to obey the ordinance which Jesus has appointed as initiatory to the kingdom of God. When I see him go and confess with his lips the faith of his heart, and then refuse to obey the baptismal ordinance, I feel that there is something wrong in his heart, and I would not preach baptism

to such a man: I would preach a love of God and truth, and show him the rebellious nature of sin, and that he ought to be willing to be submissive to the government of the great God. I do not know that I ought to say any thing more on this subject, as my friend takes it so hard. My friend says there will be consequences connected with us here. I do not deny it. I believe that God will judge the world, and will render to every man according as his works shall be, and that he will heap punishment upon men who pervert his Word. But here is an assembly convened out of curiosity, to listen to the first discourse of the Apostle Peter. At the close of it they interrupt him, crying out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do to be saved?" My friend comes up and says that these were all pardoned. Did these men go up to the "mourners' bench?" They were pardoned before repentance, or else they were not pardoned when Peter said they were. Now, he may comment on this as often as he pleases, and twist it into as many contortions as a boa constrictor, but in every position in which he undertakes to place himself, this question will stare him full in the face; and when penitents inquire what to do, he can only answer without violating the truth: "Repent in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." He

never can get around it from this day to eternity. In his last speech he declared clearly that baptism was not for the remission of sin. Had he been present on the day of Pentecost, he would have said: "Stop, brother Peter. Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *not* for the remission of sins. Do not teach baptism for remission, or you give these reformers a mighty battle-ax, and they will never give us any peace. You ought to insert that word *not*." Oh! he is afraid of it. Why, if brother Robinson would come out in the *Recorder*, and tell his brethren that he was going to preach as the apostle Paul did, and when sinners inquired for salvation, would tell them to repent in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, there would come to him fifty letters in one day, telling him that the doctrine is wrong and he must not preach it. But my friend has come out in his scholarly way and informs us that wash is from *louo*, in Acts xxii. 16. Well, did I say the word wash here came from *baptizo*? Ananias says: "Arise and be baptized." Here it is *baptizo*. And what follows "wash away thy sins"? Brother Fisher would have stopped Ananias and told him to explain—that it was not to *wash* away sins—"you are mistaken, you have got the matter wrong end foremost." By the way, I want to find what Paul's prayer was. When

the Lord came to Ananias, Ananias says: "We have heard of Paul, he is a persecutor, and has got authority to bind all who call on thy name." The Lord made an explanation to remove his fears, telling him that he appeared to him on the way, and had shown him great things, and in conclusion, says, "Behold he prayeth." In the original it is, "Behold he prayeth *to me.*" There was nothing new about Paul's praying. He prayed every day from a child, but it *was* new to pray to Christ, and the Lord explains, "Behold he prayeth to me." As soon as Ananias heard he was praying to Jesus, he was willing to go to him. I want to know what he prayed for? We have his prayer recorded in sacred history in one explicit sentence. When Saul heard the voice, he fell to the earth, and said, "Who art thou, Lord?" And the Lord said, "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest." Then Saul asked the Lord what he should do, and was told to arise and go to the city, which he did. Ananias went to Saul, and said, "Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost." Now, says he, "Why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." My brother says, "Did you ever see a man that had a good conscience, and was not pardoned?" Well, I

have seen some, and have heard of one in particular, who was not pardoned, though he had a good conscience. Saul, in relating his experience before King Agrippa, says, "I have lived in all good conscience until this day." "Well," says brother Fisher, "he was pardoned." There is one secret yet. Paul says, "I was the chief of sinners." Now, sirs, is there any of my friend's doctrine here? No. He had a good conscience—he did not live in violation of his conscience—and still he was the "chief of sinners." He asked the Lord what he would have him do? Says he, "Go to Damascus, and there it shall be told thee what thou must do to be saved." He goes, waits, and prays to the Lord to know what he was to do. Ananias tells him: "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Come, brother Fisher, I want to preach just as the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ did, and not try to prove they were pardoned before they were. Come, let us preach as the apostles did, and let that come first which stands first in the holy record, and not try to reverse the existing order, and put pardon first, and get it all disjointed in this kind of style.

He wants me to answer categorically. He is going to draw me up here to give a strict account of myself. He desires to know whether "born of water" means John's baptism or Christ's baptism? Well, John never baptized any body

into the kingdom of God. The old Baptist Church that John set up back there, was before the Christian dispensation came in. I do not want my friend under John—I want him under Jesus, and Jesus will show him how a man will get into his kingdom. He says to Nicodemus: “Except a man be born again, he can not enter into the kingdom of God.” The kingdom is the Church of God; and he can not enter into the privileges and immunities of the Church of God unless he be born of water and of the Spirit, which are the initiatory steps.

My friend explains baptism to be the answer of a good conscience. He forgot to give the most of that passage. He has an old blank book, upon which he has pasted disconnected passages, and has left out most of this verse. I have a whole Bible with me; it is a right new one, and I took it because there was not a mark in it. I do not like this plan of cutting up and patching Bibles. I suppose he left out the main body of that passage of the apostle; and I would like for him to go a little further back, where Peter speaks of the salvation of Noah. 1 Peter iii. 21: “The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us.” He don’t like that phrase, “save us.” It is not good old Baptist doctrine—it is not setting up the “old landmarks.” He and his brethren have got a tremendous relish for those “old land-

marks." But, sirs, these are only modern landmarks—they have been made by unauthorized minds. "Well, now," says one, "that doctrine is a little too strong, and I would like for you to modify it a little." But, sir, the apostle explains that expression, and I have not the privilege or prerogative to modify the language of the Holy Ghost, which says, "the like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us." Are you going to leave out that portion of the passage which brother Fisher quoted? I would put my foot upon any theory, the advocates of which would dim these bright and glorious visions, or who would be compelled to suppress or add supplements to the oracles of the Living God. Let the Word of the Almighty be quoted freely—let the world hear, and let the nations of the Lord know when he speaks. There is nothing in the passage a man need hesitate to quote: "As Noah was saved in the ark, so are we saved by baptism." But this thing of a man having a good conscience, and having to wait a long time to get the answer of it, is a mystery I can not solve, nor tell how even the fruitful imagination of my friend can unravel.

He has been telling you that I make faith, repentance, and baptism, all essential precisely alike. Well, I declare, if I have said any thing on that score, it has entirely escaped my memory. Is there any body here who can recollect

that I said they were essential all precisely alike? Is it so, or did my friend just make the statement himself? I said this: That there are three conditions explicitly stated by the Word of God—baptism is a condition, faith is a condition, repentance is a condition. I pretend not to say which is the greater or less condition; but that which God makes a condition, let no man put asunder. Let us comply with them, and then we have a right to claim his promises.

There are a great many things my friend said which I can not get at, as I have no implements small enough to work on them. I notice one great effort at argument (and he talks about logical minds in a very profound style), and let us see this specimen of strong logic. He quotes a passage which tells us that the blood of Jesus Christ was shed for many for the remission of sins. Well, it is for the remission of sins—there is no question about that; and still the language is exactly the same as in Acts ii., and the same as in our proposition. “Well, now,” says he, “if baptism is for the remission of sins, how can it be that the blood of Jesus is shed for many for the remission of sins?” But does it not say, that “we are baptized into that which doth also now save us”? And will he declare that this passage is not true, because it is said we are saved by his blood, because we are saved by his life, because we are justified by the Spirit

of our God? Is there not intelligence enough in the Christian ministry of the present generation to show the exact place that the blood of the Covenant occupies? Has not every thing its own proper place? I believe I must use a homely illustration, which I got from a brother back in Indiana. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FISHER'S THIRD REPLY.]

Brethren Moderators:

My learned opponent appeared a little nettled at Brother Robinson for sending me a note, under the supposition that he was assisting me in this controversy. I did not object, when that "venerable brother" helped him out in his Masonic figure. I am perfectly willing that my opponent shall get all the help that he can, both inside and outside of this meeting-house, for he greatly stands in need of help, and I pray God to help him understand the truth which is revealed in this precious book. I incurred his most desperate displeasure by having notes in my family Testament, a book which I always read, when, with my little family, I bow in prayer before the Giver of every good and perfect gift; but he will sit here, and upon the back of a Bible will make notes, and objects to my making notes inside of mine. If, from

an old Bible, which has been worn out by constant use, I cut certain passages of Scripture, and place them among my notes, why does my opponent object to that, while I am not opposed to his quoting from a new Bible he has never read, and which afterward turns out to be a hymn book, and on the pages of which there is not to be found a single pencil mark! But, if my opponent only reads the book or books from which he has obtained his doctrine, this new Bible will lie upon his shelf until on its lids the dust of time will so thickly accumulate, that in it he may with his finger scrawl—*baptismal regeneration!*

My opponent again brought forward the figure of Masonry, and in which he contradicted himself most peremptorily. He said that what I believed he believed. Now, if my opponent believes this, as a matter of course he does not believe that baptism has any thing to do with the remission of sins! I say a man must be a Christian in heart, which, if he is before entering the church, it does not require a logician to prove that baptism has nothing to do in making him a Christian. Compare this statement with his proposition, when he boldly affirms that baptism is for the remission of sins—when he has repeated, again and again, that there is no pardon without baptism. If a man can be a Christian without pardon—if he can be a

Christian without having the remission of his sins—then, my beloved hearers, what becomes of my friend's system of baptism for remission? My friend has, whether he intended it or not, contradicted himself in this statement. The case of Masonry which has been brought forward, is one of the most beautiful analagous figures that could have been produced, expository of the doctrine which I am now advocating. Suppose the man who is made a Mason in heart, goes to the lodge of a Master Mason, the question which will be asked is, "Where were you made a Mason?" He answers——. Well, I presume there is no harm in telling. "We all know where he was made a Mason," says my friend—"it was in heart." Well, then, if he was made a Mason in heart, was he not a Mason? Can he be in heart a Mason, and at the same time not a Mason? Now, in order to enjoy the immunities and privileges of the lodge, and secure the fellowship of his brethren, he takes upon himself an obligation, but he is not baptized for the remission of his unmasonic sins. No, sir; he takes upon himself an obligation, by and through which he is entitled to certain rights and privileges of a free and accepted Mason. So I say the believer is made a Christian in heart—his heart is changed by divine grace, and he is now in the possession of a good conscience. Now, there are certain rights

and privileges to be obtained in the Church, viz., the fellowship of his brethren, and the communion of the Lord's body and blood. He is not a member of the Church formally and declaratively, yet he is a Christian in heart. Now, after he is initiated into the Church, he sits down with the disciples at the Lord's table, and over the bloody symbols of the broken body and shed blood of my Lord and Master, again swears allegiance to the King of kings and Lord of lords. Now, I have the man a Christian when his heart is changed; but my opponent has him a Christian *always*, even before initiation, or his analogy about the Masons is false; for he stated that a man is a Christian in heart as one is a Mason in heart, and yet he has the boldness to tell us that he is not in the possession of the remission of his sins until he is baptized; therefore he is not a Christian. If you can understand these palpable contradictions—if you can harmonize them—it is more than I can do. It is true that my opponent has been greatly blessed, both physically and mentally, having strong lungs and a great deal of boldness; and these seem to be the most prominent traits in his character. His boldness enables him, unblushingly, to deal in positive and round assertions.

He goes to John iii. 5, and he answers categorically, as he says, in part only. He did not

tell us whose baptism it was, but only informed us whose baptism it was not, leaving us to conjecture whose it was. He says that it was not John's baptism! When the man travailed in pain to bring forth the fact that it was not John's baptism, why did he not, in the same agony of utterance—the same anguish of verbal parturition—tell us whose baptism it *was*? My friend, in this controversy, reminds me very much of a celebrated and eccentric character, rejoicing in the euphaneous cognomen of "Live-forever Jones," who presented six pages of foolscap, closely written, to Governor Powell, for his inspection. He read it. "What do you think of it, Governor?" "Why," said he, "for the life of me, Mr. Jones, I do not see the points." "Read it again," says Live-forever. The Governor re-read it, but says he again, "I declare I am unable to discover any points." Says Live-forever, "I have made no points, for they will hang me upon them." The very good reason, my hearers, why my friend made no points, was, because he was afraid I would hang him up before this audience on them. Why did he not tell us whose baptism it was, in order that we may arrive at the truth? Why all this quibbling and dodging of points? Now, in relation to this being "born of water and of the Spirit," I will make a statement. Nicodemus was a Jew, as was also Jesus Christ, who used

Jewish phraseology to this Jewish teacher in Israel, language which he could understand. Well, he tells him in the third verse, that he "must be born again or he can not see the kingdom of God. You have been born under the old Sinai Covenant—born of flesh. Now, Nicodemus, you must be born again, or you can not see the kingdom of God." Here is a plain statement, but Nicodemus did not understand what being "born again" meant. The Jews are said to be born again—born of God and from above, but the Gentiles are no where said to be born again, within the lids of this book. Born of God and of the Spirit, but not born again as the Jews. Nicodemus was born a Jew, by virtue of which, together with the Covenant of Sinai and the true circumcision, he was entitled to the privileges and immunities of the Jews, in the old Jewish theocracy. Now, he comes to the Savior to inquire concerning the qualifications requisite to gain admittance into his kingdom. The Savior having made the statement to him in the third verse, he now says in the fifth: "Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom." Are we to understand the term "born of water," literally or figuratively? Are we to understand it as having a literal or a symbolical meaning? My opponent says that it is not metaphorical, but literally baptism. But does

not the Savior explain, in the sixth verse—"that which is born of the flesh is flesh;" and there must be something in contradistinction to this—"that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." You are made a Jew by being born of the flesh, you must now be a Christian by being born of the Spirit. Does not the sixth verse show most plainly that the Savior had no reference to water baptism literally? If it is baptism at all, it is used only as a symbol of regeneration, or the new birth, which is effected by the Spirit of God.

You find, then, from the premises, this clear deduction (as he has admitted the premises he must admit the conclusion)—if that which is born of flesh is flesh, that which is born of the Spirit and water, is Spirit and water. Now, can he get away from the conclusion? Why not avow it then? Why make the thing absurd? His system reduces the Savior's sermon to Nicodemus to an absolute absurdity. The Savior, in the fifth verse, explains what he means by saying, "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." Well, in the eighth verse, he gives him another explanation which he can not misunderstand, and like my opponent, he might have a bible, Moses, and the prophets, yet he gets them from the Rabbinical doctors, as my contentent gets them from the *Millennial Harbinger*, or looks at

them through some other person's glasses, instead of looking them full in the face—beaming with the splendors of divine truth. The Savior says, in the seventh verse: “The wind bloweth where it listeth, and we hear the sound thereof, but we can not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.” Can we be said to baptize a man who is already baptized? He knows when and where he was baptized, so is every one that is born of water. But here his Spirit is compared to the wind, and of the Spirit he is born. Did not Jesus say to such persons as Nicodemus, that he came unto his own, and his own received him not; but as many as received him, to them gave he power or privilege to become the sons of God, even to them that believed on his name, which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God: so it is to every one that is born of the Spirit. Why did Christ reproach Nicodemus, in the next verse, for his ignorance, if born of water here means baptism? Christ told him whose baptism it was, but my opponent could not do as the blessed Savior did. I screwed the fact out of him, that it was not John's baptism, but have, as yet, been unable to wring from him the information as to whose it was. But, sirs, he will find himself compelled to tell, “or tie up to the bank,” for he cannot “run the lick”

without telling. "Art thou a teacher in Israel," said the blessed Redeemer, "and knowest not these things?" Yes, the very things I have been talking about—the new birth, and the kingdom. If born of water is baptism, how could Nicodemus have learned it from Moses and the prophets; and why reproach a man for not knowing a thing which was not taught in the Old Testament scriptures as John's or Christ's baptism? It was not John's baptism, for my opponent says John's baptism introduced no man into the kingdom. I thank him for the admission, but I say that if born of water is baptism, it is not Christian baptism, because the ordinance was not then instituted; for, granting my opponent's position, and the position of the disciples, the kingdom was not set up until the day of Pentecost, and how could you introduce a man into a kingdom that did not exist? [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FRANKLIN'S FOURTH ADDRESS.]

I shall not undertake to describe the character of my opponent, and tell you what advantages he has in the strength of his lungs, nor in some other respects, for I have no doubt you perceive where he lacks strength.

I desire to call your attention, for a moment,

to this subject of being a Christian in heart, and not one throughout. I stated, in the outset, that there are three divine changes in a conversion to Christianity—that one is a change in the heart, the second is a change in the character, and the third is a change in the relation. I doubt if there are a dozen persons with perceptions so obtunded as not to see clearly that a man may be changed in heart and not changed in life, or changed in both, and yet be unchanged in relation. Persons of opposite sex may experience a heartfelt affection, and their feelings toward each other may be the same as if they were in the marriage covenant, but still it is requisite that there should be a change in their actions, and a change in their relations is equally requisite. Well, faith in each other changes their hearts; the feelings and necessary preparations for the marriage ceremony change the actions; but they have no right to the immunities and joys of that state until the marriage ceremony, which is the consummating act, has been pronounced. Baptism never changed the heart of any man, it never changed his character; but a man whose heart is changed, a man who repents of his sins, is a Christian in heart and character; and then what remains is a change of the state or relations. Our Heavenly Father has established a visible ceremony, the passing through of which brings the man into

the new state or relation. On this account, we never heard of a man believing into Christ, repenting into Christ, or praying into Christ. The reason is, that belief goes before entering into Christ—even calling upon the name of the Lord precedes it, and baptism is the only act of entering in. “By one Spirit you are all baptized into one body.”

Now, there is another thing mysterious about my friend. I have twice made an effort to induce him to notice certain passages of Scripture, but up to this moment I have obtained no kind of respect. The first passage reads: “By one Spirit ye are all baptized into one body.” To this he paid not the slightest attention; but in his last speech he has made an assertion which amounts to the same thing. He says, “they are initiated by baptism into the fellowship of the Church, and they are Christians before their initiation.” Well, what does he think of these Christians before they are initiated by baptism? He says, “I do not fellowship you, although Jesus Christ has received you, though all heaven has received you, and all good people ought to acknowledge that you are Christians, still you can not come to the Lord’s table; I have no fellowship for you; you must be baptized before you can be fellowshipped in *our* church.” If God has received an individual, if the Holy Spirit has

taken up its abode in the heart of a person, if the man is truly a Christian—why, I ask, can my friend be so hard-hearted as to say to this unbaptized believer, “I will not fellowship you, you must be baptized.” And why be baptized? He says in his last speech but one, “God forbid I should say baptism is not essential.” He lifted up his hand and trembled in such profound awe. I ask, in God’s name, has he not been trying to make this audience believe that a man can not only get the forgiveness of his sins, but be saved without it; and has he not tried to fasten the consequence doctrine upon me, that a man must be damned without it? O, it is essential, to come into *our* church, and sit down at the Lord’s table—you cannot come into *our* church and fellowship without it. God forbid he should say it is not essential. When he comes to examine it, he says it is merely essential to be received into his fellowship. Why, my friend, I would not care the snap of my finger to have your church-fellowship, if the Holy Spirit of God received me. If I obtained the forgiveness of my sins, and got admittance into heaven, I would not turn my hand over to be baptized. Not essential to any thing that God has promised in this world or the world to come! God has never taught any such doctrine as this. I have called his attention to this passage over and over again. I have shown

him that God makes faith and baptism conditions upon which a man obtains forgiveness; but, as yet, I can get no kind of attention from him. But I am not done yet with this change in a man's heart. He says a man who is a Christian in heart, is pardoned. I do wonder if it has come to this, that we have preachers here, past the middle of the nineteenth century, in the days of development and reformation, who confound the pardon of sins with the change in a man's heart, which only prepares him for pardon! Why, if you pardon him with all the malignity and wickedness in his heart, he will sin again. But the change in a man's heart is preparatory to coming into a state of justification. The change of heart takes place in a man, and the pardon of his sins is in heaven for him.

I was trying to explain the difference between the change which takes place in a man's feelings. As illustrative of this, suppose I was living neighbor to brother Fisher, and by trespassing, have injured him to the amount of one thousand dollars. He reasons against it, shows me the impropriety and wickedness of such a course, and, by his repeated importunity, makes at last an impression on my heart. I will go and beg pardon for what I have done—I am sorry for having trespassed. There is a change in my heart, and a change in my actions: now is every

thing square? Is the whole matter between him and myself completely adjusted? I think he would be pretty liable to ask me for something else. I tell him, "Brother Fisher, I am changed in my heart; you can not imagine the amount of love I have for you; I have quit trespassing, and will do nothing in this way again." I think he would begin to reflect—"Where is the thousand dollars' injury you have been inflicting upon me?" Does this change any of my feelings? The injury is the same as before, and so are my actions. Suppose I tell him, "I want to have this whole matter settled: I have injured you to the amount of a thousand dollars, but I have not a dollar in the world; I am a destitute creature. Is there any way by which this matter can be equitably adjusted?" He would turn and say, "I have a plan upon which it can be settled. I am wealthy, and able to cancel the debt. I freely and graciously forgive it all." When he does this my heart is changed, and I am prepared for pardon. I have changed my life, and this secures me against danger in time to come. He holds the pardoning power which he confers, and I stand in a state of reconciliation with him. Here comes the proclamation. Jesus is pouring out his blood on the cross; the attention of the world is arrested and directed to him. O, look to him! the sinner considers his loveliness and gracious kindness, and says,

“I am sorry that I ever sinned against him. I am changed in my feelings, I am changed in my heart; I love God and all mankind, and I will now change my life, and will sin no more against him.” Well, the man is now prepared for pardon. He says, “I have no disposition, and never intend to sin or transgress any more. I love God with all my heart, but I have no power to blot out these sins, or to save myself, or purchase pardon. What shall I do?” He goes to God, and he puts forth the pardoning power and graciously forgives all his sins; and when he submits himself to the initiatory rite in the name of the Savior, his sins are blotted from the book of remembrance. You see, then, that the change in the man’s heart produces an effect on his mind which changes his character, and prepares him for a change of state, to be introduced into the new state. Well, now, this is precisely the state of case with the Mason, as I must make one more reference to that illustration. The gentleman tries hard to make you believe that a man is a Mason before he is one. The man listens to their speeches and the explanations as far as they can be made. The whole matter begins to work its way into his heart—he feels more favorably inclined, and at last he goes to some Mason, and says, “I have changed—I begin to feel terribly—I believe I am a Mason in heart, but I want to be one in a visible and

acknowledged form. Brother Fisher, come and go with me to the lodge or hall." I will venture that he will not be slow in putting the subject in a way to take the initiatory steps, for without them you can never tell when a man is in, or when he is not. While at one time my friend is endeavoring to explain this matter, he quotes this passage: "The wind bloweth where it listeth," &c., and he wants you to learn how a man is initiated, but I take the steps laid down in the New Testament. He commands all men every where to repent. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." "By one Spirit you are all baptized into one body." "So many of you as have been baptized into Jesus Christ have been baptized into his birth." I quote these passages as expository of the manner in which a man enters in; but what respect does he pay to them?

I believe I must take the liberty to bring him once more to John iii. He strained his lungs in repeating over and over again that I could not tell whether it was John's baptism or that of Christ—that he twisted and screwed, but could not get the balance out of me. Well, I do not know whether he was so much excited as to injure his defective memory or not; but if I did not tell him that it was the baptism

that initiates us into the kingdom of Jesus Christ, why, then, my memory has failed me most prodigiously. He implies that there was something so fearful in the information, that I trembled so I could not speak it out. I could not help thinking, then, of the two opposite characters he comes out here and describes before the audience, and he might injure me prodigiously if the people would believe it. He says I have strong lungs, and am very bold—that is one of my characteristics; then, in the next breath, he says I am afraid, tremble from sheer cowardice, and am one of the most timorous characters in the world. Now, I cannot see how I can have these two characteristics so diametrically opposite—bold and daring, timorous and fearful!! I come out broad and square, and state that the baptism alluded to by this figure, is the baptism by which a man is initiated into the kingdom of God, and is what you call Christian baptism, and not John's baptism. I know the strength, the style, and the power of the pens and the tongues of Baptist divines. I have looked over them carefully, and know the prettiest things they can say in regard to this matter. My friend may get up here and comment upon this as much as he pleases, but he never can controvert the truth.

But now we must go back and look over his criticism. I expect that long word, "exegesis,"

that he gave us in his last speech, is the exegesis of John iii. 5. He says that no Gentile has ever taught that he must be born again—that language does not relate to the Gentiles. Well, I wonder if he does not believe Gentiles are born again! I would like to hear him come out and declare that he does not believe that Gentiles are to be born again. What did the Lord say to Nicodemus? “Except a man be born again, he can not enter into the kingdom of God.” Is not “born again” synonymous with regeneration? Has he found a method by which Gentiles can get into the kingdom of God without regeneration, or being born again?

Mr. Fisher. Here is what I said, and he can turn to it. The Jews were said to have been born from above, born of God; and that they must be born again, as Christ said to Nicodemus. I said it was nowhere stated, within the lids of the Bible, that a Gentile must be born again—but born of God. If born of God, are they not born of the Spirit—are they not regenerated? This is what I said.

Mr. Franklin. No better than it was before. I want to know of him explicitly, if he believes that any Gentile can get into the kingdom of God without being born of God?

Mr. Fisher. I have admitted that.

Mr. Franklin. That is just what I thought

of it at first. But I want to look now at this case again. The Lord says to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." Well, the Savior tells him, not to marvel if you do not understand when I teach you of earthly things. Now, says God, "marvel not that I say unto you, you must be born again." I want to notice that it is indispensable to be born again, and he admitted in his last speech that if the passage referred to baptism at all, it was a figurative or symbolical reference. We know it is a figurative reference to baptism. Hear, then, the Lord, in referring to his own statement: "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." If he is changed by the teachings of the Spirit of God, and baptized in the name of the Savior, is he not born again? The Savior, referring to this, says, "Marvel not that I said you must be born again." My friend quotes the expression, "The wind bloweth where it listeth," &c. I doubt very much whether my friend understands that passage at all. I have heard hundreds of men whom I was certain knew nothing about it, quote it as confidently as he has done; but I am not afraid, however, to walk up to this passage and take one square look at it. The original, translated Spirit, is *pnumatos*. It occurs eighty-three times, is translated Spirit, and so

far as I have been able to find the criticisms in the best authorities, I know of no reason for translating it wind, here. I never saw any thing that looked like a reason for rendering it wind, in this passage; but the very spiritual minded academician translators deemed it proper thus to translate it wind. It ought to have been correctly translated—“The Spirit blows.” Well, the word blows, I am satisfied from the best criticisms, should be breathes; and again, the word sound should be rendered voice. “The Spirit of God breathes (speaks), and you hear his voice; in other words, you hear his language; so is every one born,” &c. When the ellipsis is properly filled up, it reads—“And the hearer hears his voice.” If this is not the meaning of the passage, whence the expression in the sixth chapter of Romans? concerning which, however, I want to speak. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FISHER'S FOURTH REPLY.]

My opponent not only showed to this assembly that he was confused, but at one time was exhorting us like a good old-fashioned sing-song Baptist, and at another time was misrepresenting me. I do not say that he would do so wilfully and knowingly, neither would I say that it was in consequence of any mental obli-

quity, for I regard him in the same light that most of his brethren do, as the Magnus Apollo of the Reformation, from Cincinnati, in the Valley of the Mississippi, a little this side of Bethany, Brooke county, Virginia!! My friend's speech reminded me very much of a mechanics' sign I once heard of, which read, "All kinds of turning and twisting done here." It was perceptible to the audience, which my friend says is intelligent, and which I am willing to endorse. His evident embarrassment may, perhaps, be traced to the effect produced by that big word "exegesis;" but a man who possesses a mouth of the capacity of his, could, I think, pronounce that word without breaking his jaw-bone. I will give him another big word. It may be that "born of water and of the Spirit," is what is called a *metonymical* term; and if my friend does not understand what a metonymy of speech means, I will bring Webster's unabridged dictionary, and let him stand up and explain it. If born of water is Christian baptism, as he has assumed, and as he has in his last speech told us, when was Nicodemus to be introduced into the kingdom? I say that it could not have been Christian baptism, because, at the time of this conversation with Nicodemus, Christian baptism did not exist; and to talk about it being a Christian ordinance, when that ordinance did not exist, is simply preposterous.

And if the position of my opponent is true, it was likewise folly to talk about entering a kingdom which did not exist; for my contentent will certainly take the position that the kingdom, as well as Christian baptism, did not exist at the time of this conversation. If he will tell you, as Mr. Campbell has told us—and is nowhere found, only in his writings and the writings of the Disciples—that the kingdom was set up upon the day of Pentecost, why, then, talk to a man about a thing which did not exist—why talk to him about Christian baptism, not in existence? No such thing in the moral universe of God—and talk to him about entering a kingdom that had not been set up! Suppose I should tell you that you must do so and so in order to enter into a house. Well, say you, the house does not exist, how shall I enter into it? O, say I, it will be built hereafter. Now, where is God's authority for that belief? If my opponent will read that whole chapter, he will find that the Savior explained the question of Nicodemus—"How can these things be?"—in the most beautiful language, using water as the most appropriate figure and emblem, in enlightening his ignorance. Why, it was impossible for him to be baptized when there was no baptism—to enter a kingdom when it did not exist. They could not be. Why reproach Nicodemus for a thing of this

kind? Why upbraid him for not understanding baptism as a Christian institution, when it was not taught in Moses or the prophets, and when Jesus did not teach it to Nicodemus there, for he had not instituted it yet, and the kingdom had not been set up? “Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things?” says the Savior to him (and he knew he could not misunderstand him). “If I had told you of earthly things, and you believed not, how will you believe if I tell you of heavenly things?” He then states, in John iii. 14, 15, after having pointed him to what Moses had said in Deuteronomy concerning the type of Jesus Christ—the brazen serpent—a thing that Nicodemus could not misunderstand—“As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.” Now, would Nicodemus understand these Jews to be looking upon the brazen serpent that Moses had placed on the end of a pole, at the command of God, and every serpent-stung or serpent-bitten Israelite who looked upon it as being healed by a bodily act upon the part of themselves, or upon the part of somebody else assisting them to perform the bodily act? And now where is the analogy, if Jesus Christ has not presented it clearly? The Israelites looked with a natural eye: we

poor sinners, convicted of and sorry for our sins, look with the eye of faith to Jesus, and with the hand of faith lay hold upon the atoning merits of the crucified Savior, and are released from sin and the thralldom of Satan. If it is not so, then my friend will break this chain of analogy asunder, and he will do it in order to build up a mere theory or system, which had its origin in the sixteenth century, when the Roman Catholics, in their Council of Trent, decreed that, whomsoever shall affirm that born of water is not baptism, let him be accursed! This, like infant baptism and baptismal regeneration, is the great master error, and the prop and pillar of popery. It had its origin in the womb of the "Mother of Harlots"—it derived its nourishment from the bosom of that church. Mr. Campbell, in his debate with McCalla, in Washington, Mason county, Kentucky, adopts that child into his religious family, and it has since become the pet of my opponent and the Disciples of the nineteenth century. It was embraced by Barton W. Stone and McNamar; also by Marshal, who returned to the bosom of the Presbyterian Church, one of the most orthodox churches in the world upon the doctrine of salvation by grace. Stone continued in the error until the day of his death. McNamar joined the Shakers—dreamed, saw sights and visions, and danced until he shuffled off this mortal

coil.—“Even so must the Son of Man be lifted up,” says Jesus, but not so, says my opponent. “I know that the Jews looked with the natural eye upon the image of the brazen serpent—I know we must look with the eye of faith upon Jesus, but then we are not healed until we are baptized for the remission of our sins”! Now, who tells the whole truth in relation to this matter? Will my contentent take issue with my blessed Savior, and will he say, in the face of this analogy, drawn by the hand of the incarnate Son of God—that Being who can not lie—that embodiment of the Godhead, in whose lips of immaculate purity guile was never found? He says, “Whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life.” Do you understand the figure which I have now presented to you? “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, and all who had been bitten and looked upon it were healed, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up.” We, too, have been bitten by the serpent of sin; we are in a state of condemnation; we are standing upon the verge of eternity; the sword of divine justice, in fiery circles, waves over our heads; our hearts are in ruins—broken in consequence of sin; we are sorry for having sinned against God. What must we do? Just lift the eye of faith to Jesus, look upon him through the full light of the everlasting gospel—look unto Him,

all ye ends of the earth, and be ye saved. Look, Africa, with your ninety-nine millions; look, ye millions of China, ye millions of Burmah—look—come down from your primeval mountains, pour out from your dense jungles, and with the eye of faith gaze upon the world's Redeemer—upon the cross; “for whosoever believeth, shall not perish, but have everlasting life;” “for God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life.” What philanthropy! God so loved the world, and the world in rebellion against the King of kings and the Lord of lords—so loved it, as to transcend the lofty grasp of the intelligences that bathe their pinions in the diamond splendors of the throne, and come down to this world, and pass from the cradle to the garden, from the garden to the cross, then to the tomb, then to the summit of Mount Olivet, from which he ascended into heaven, and now reigns the sceptered God of the Universe! Look to Him and you shall be saved. When they look, they receive pardon. I say it is the duty of these believers to be baptized. My opponent stated, that I did not fellowship unbaptized believers, and wanted to know my reason for not so doing. I made no such statement. Every unbaptized Presbyterian, Methodist, &c., if they believe in Jesus

Christ, is just as much justified in the sight of God, as was Abraham before the Christian institution existed. I have Christian fellowship for them, but my opponent has none for them until they are baptized for the remission of their sins! And he wants to know why I will not commune with these. Why, sir, he knows that there is no law of God, no precept, no example, for me to commune with unbaptized believers, no more than there is to baptize an unbeliever. This, sir, is the reason why. According to your system, if they believe in Jesus Christ and repent of their sins, and fail to be baptized for the remission of their sins, they are all consigned to eternal perdition, for their sins are not remitted; and if they go to heaven, they go there without the remission of their sins, for baptism is for the remission of sins. What a mighty heart has my opponent! Is this the great Benjamin Franklin—the benefactor of man—the philosopher, who drew the lightnings of heaven down to his feet, and in his crucible analyzed the thunderbolt, by which he has saved the lives and property of millions? No, sir! it is Benjamin Franklin, late of Cincinnati, Ohio, who, in his benevolence, will invite men and women to the Lord's table, whose sins are not remitted! He says, "baptism is for the remission of sins, yet I fellowship you because your sins are not remitted"! I will not invite

you to come to the Lord's table until you are baptized. Jesus has commanded it, and no dutiful child, if he understands his Father's will, can refuse to be baptized. To be a Christian, he must be born again, and then let him, by being baptized, declare to the world that he has received newness of life.

My opponent says he has tried, time and again, to get me to notice the passage, viz., "Being baptized of one Spirit into one body." Have ever I denied this? In fact, that position proves entirely too much for him. It is not by one *baptism*, but the Book says it is by one *Spirit* that we are to be baptized into one body. I will show you something about this Spirit, how it was received, given, and imparted, before this debate closes. In John iii. Christ says, "He that believeth on the Son of God shall have everlasting life." Now, can a man be in the possession of everlasting life, and not be baptized into this one body mystical? This is the spiritual body of Christ, and we are baptized by one Spirit into this spiritual body. Whosoever believeth on the Son of God hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not, shall see the wrath of God. Here is a column of truth, whose base reaches down to the very depths of depravity, and whose circumference extends to wherever the foot of man has trod the soil of the globe, whose summit is bathed in the beatific

splendors of eternal day; and beneath this pillar of light and truth, baptismal regeneration must lie entombed so deep that the trump of the last day, and the arm of my opponent, with the assistance of all his brethren, will never be able to bring it up! [*Time expired.*]

FRIDAY, JUNE 5, 8 o'clock, P. M.

[MR. FRANKLIN'S FIFTH ADDRESS.]

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I appear before you to make my last address on this subject. I now have one hour to introduce some additional arguments, and to make a brief recapitulation of the principal points in discussion. As it regards the personal allusions of the gentleman in his last speech, and some of his anecdotes, I do not pretend that I can keep pace with him in such matters. With his fruitful imagination, and being accustomed as he is to deal in gallimatia, it would be useless for me to attempt to cope with him; and besides, I have no disposition to do any thing of the kind, and hope you will excuse me from undertaking it.

There is one important point to which I have alluded several times, and which I want to keep distinctly before this audience: it is, that my worthy friend has no plan of induction into the

kingdom of God; and I am safe in saying that he has not quoted one single passage of Scripture stating the manner in which a man enters into the kingdom of God. There is not a person in this assembly who can recollect of his having set forth any particular steps, or expounded any process, by which such object can be attained. It is one thing for him to get up and set forth the dangerous consequences attendant on my doctrine, but he experiences no little difficulty in making an explicit statement explanatory of the manner in which forgiveness of sins is to be obtained. He has not, and can not, present a reasonable plan. If he was disposed to launch out as he did when he was holding his meeting here, it is true that he might invite sinners to come up to the altar of prayer; but to show you where any apostle of Jesus Christ ever practiced that method, where any person in ancient times ever came into the Church in that way, or where God ever required any thing of that kind, is what he never did, nor never can do!

I call your attention to another matter which he has omitted on the way. It is this: He claims that persons are Christians before they are baptized, that they receive pardon before baptism. Now, if I can get his attention, I invite him to show one passage from the day Jesus ascended to heaven, to the final amen of the New Testament, where a person is pardoned

before he is baptized, or where, before baptism, a person is recognized as a disciple of Jesus Christ or as a Christian! If this were the last speech he ever made, he could not find one instance where a man was recognized as a Christian before baptism—not one case. I have quoted passage after passage, showing that a man who believes on his Redeemer and is baptized, comes to the forgiveness of and the washing away of sins, but he disregards them. There are several other matters that I wish to examine closely. Somebody who was away during our last interview, remarked in my hearing, that they heard a little girl say that my friend, Brother Fisher, quotes Scripture about every thing but remission of sins. Now, this is one trouble which I have with his speech all the time. Our proposition is about remission of sins; but all the eloquent discourse which he delivered about lifting up the serpent in the wilderness, as it happened, contained not one word on remission of sins—not one word about the process of conversion to Christianity! As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, therefore baptism is not for the remission of sins!! If that is logic, a long stride must be taken between the premises and the conclusion.

There is one peculiarity among our friends: as they get nearer right they begin to understand us better, they come up and complacently say

we have changed. I like to see them talking this way, for it shows the change is, generally, in themselves. But of all that class who talk this way, there is one peculiarity, and that is, you may discuss the subject of conversion, and they will quote every passage in the Bible before they come to that which relates directly to the subject. They will tell you about raising the dead, opening the eyes of the blind, &c., &c., how many times I can not tell, but they always manage to skip every passage in the Bible that speaks of conversion to Christianity. In the name of reason, when they stand before this people with the eye of God upon them, why can not they give the passage which speaks in relation to the induction into the kingdom? When Jesus and the apostles preached, and pointed it out, what reason have they for acting thus.

My worthy opponent says that the doctrine that I profess is most horrible! He remembers his polite reference to Brigham Young. I see he can not get along now without naming over these parties against which the people have such strange feelings, and intimating that there must be some peculiar congeniality between these hypocritical people and ourselves. Now, if you please, just look at his conduct. Have you seen me, since the commencement of this discussion, equivocate, hesitate, and falter in any

passage in the Word of God? On the other hand, have you not seen my friend falter, choke, and stammer over the words of Peter on the day of Pentecost? Did I not show him, at the beginning of this debate, that Holy Ghost baptism never initiated any person at all? Why will he not, before his God and in the presence of this audience, read the last commission of Jesus to the apostles, and say solemnly, here I stand side by side with you on that commission. Go and see the effect it had upon the hearts of those to whom they preached it. Now, in the name of reason, if the Bible is a revelation from God, if it gives us a clear delineation of the Spirit of Christianity, and a description of the method by which the first person was inducted into the kingdom of God, why not come to this conversion, and urge the same upon every person, and why go back previous to the time of the establishment of the kingdom of God?

Now, having made these few allusions to the subject in a general way, I want to call the gentleman's attention to a few arguments. In my first speech I alluded to Peter's sermon in the portico. Having arrested their attention, he goes on to say, "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord;" and when he had concluded his discourse, some five thousand

were ready to make confession. Says he, "Repent and be converted." Now, one thing is to repent, and the other is to be converted. My friend, you know, has gone on to quote some passages where faith is mentioned, but not a word has he said about baptism. The deduction he would make, is, that baptism is left out there because it is not essential. Well, Peter said to his audience, "Repent," &c. Did he say a word about faith? Faith is entirely omitted, and shall some D.D. of the nineteenth century get up and say he left faith out? When Ananias came to Saul, he said, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Not one word about faith there; and shall a "scrap doctor" get up here and say he was converted by faith, when Ananias said nothing about it? On the day of Pentecost, when three thousand anxious inquirers exclaimed, "Men and brethren, what shall we do to be saved?" the apostle says, "Repent and be baptized." Did he, therefore, leave faith out, and is faith no part of the subject of Christianity?

What means all that argument about the serpent in the wilderness? Belief alone is his inference, and he should recollect that but one circumstance being mentioned in that place, is no evidence that others are to be left out. There are many passages in which you find nothing about the grace of God; there are others where

nothing is said about the blood of Christ: and because of this, shall one doctor select these passages to prove that grace is unnecessary, and shall another preacher build upon them a system of salvation without faith? There never was any thing more preposterous since the world was made! If God requires faith in one case, and in another repentance, he requires them in every case. If one man must repent of his sins, every man must do likewise. The circumstances of the condition not being mentioned, is no certain evidence that those conditions are not implied. Faith is not to be left out in any case, neither repentance, nor baptism, nor the love of God, nor the grace of God, nor the blood of the Everlasting Covenant; because all are implied.

But we will now return to look at Peter's words in Solomon's portico. The gentleman informs us that it is not *baptizo*; and who in reason, ever supposed that the original word, translated, was *baptizo*? It is there and in a good many other places translated *turn*. For instance, Paul says, "Repent and turn to God." The word *turn* comes from the same as *convert*, in the original. Well, says Peter, "Repent and be converted." These persons were all believers, for faith had changed their hearts, as Peter had their conditions. He commands another condition of them, viz., to *repent*;

and there are many to be added to this, which he includes in the expression, "be converted": as you now have faith, change your life. What is the turning act? Why, just before the day of Pentecost he baptizes about three thousand souls. If a man has faith in the Son of God, if he is in his heart penitent, he is a proper subject for baptism, and should enter into the covenant with God.

The gentleman talks so about the day of Pentecost, that I will just inform him that I have a passage here which I regard as a little stronger than any he has yet brought forward. "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out." Acts iii. 19. Here, then, is a passage which teaches that a man must repent and do something to his repentance, which is, to be converted; and to be converted is simply to pass from one state to another. This is precisely the same as to be pardoned that God may forgive your sins—that they may be blotted out. Again, in Romans vi. 16, you find this expression: "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" "God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin: but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you." Well, the doctrine was, that Christ died

for our sins, and that he arose again on the third day. The form of doctrine is to be in the likeness of his death, birth, and resurrection. They were baptized into his death, and were in the likeness; they were buried with him by baptism into death, and he says, "you are raised to a newness of life." Well, what is the result? Why, says he, "being now made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." Now, the gentleman can not answer the argument based upon that passage. I expect he will get up and tell you that this was a good old sing-song Baptist sermon. Well, if they will preach such sermons, I will say *amen*, even if it is in the sing-song style. There is not so much in the manner in which the doctrine is uttered, as in the doctrine itself. This is no doctrine which preachers embrace for a day, and who can not make an explicit statement of its nature; it is not a system which has no definite mode of initiation into the kingdom, but it is the doctrine which was preached by the disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ, and which was so efficacious in converting sinners.

But I suppose I have taken up as much time as I can spare in this way. I want you to recollect that the simple question now is concerning the forgiveness of sins. The first argument which I educed went to show that baptism

introduces persons into Christ, and I called your attention to certain passages of Scripture, to show you that men are saved by the life of Christ—the Spirit of God; but in order to get into the life, it is necessary that a man should get into the blood of the Covenant. I quoted a number of explicit passages of Scripture, which said, in so many words, that persons are baptized into Christ, and demanded of him to produce a passage to show that a man ever *prayed* into Christ. I can find plenty of passages where they believed in Christ, where they repented in Christ, and did many other good things; but when it comes to *entering into* Christ, I find but one single expression in the New Testament, and that is, we have to be baptized into Christ. When, then, the believer with all his heart, has repented of his sins, is baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, he enters the Covenant—the body, the life, and the Spirit of God—and has the promise of the Almighty that he shall be pardoned and saved. I called his attention to another class of scriptures, such, for instance, as the words of Ananias to Saul: “Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins.” Now, I ask any gentleman in his right reason, if it is not evident that *arise* comes first, that *baptism* comes second, and that *washing away of sins* comes after? Can any thing be more

clear than this? He was commanded to take the steps which God required of him, to comply with the conditions and reach the object which is promised in the end.

I desire every Baptist distinctly to understand that baptism is a condition which divine authority arbitrarily requires. God has made necessary such conditions as best pleased him. You may ask, why he did not make the serpent of gold or copper, and why he demanded the bitten to look toward the serpent? My friend says that looking is faith. I believe some friend has given me intelligence that he (Fisher) preached a sermon on this subject, and that it was the best discourse he ever heard; but that he connected obedience with faith in that sermon. He explained on that occasion, that it was not sufficient merely to believe, but that they had to look, and those who did not look did not live! In precisely the same way the Lord is lifted up in this wilderness of sin; and it is not sufficient that we believe, but we must obey him. Here, then, we again have in this class of Scripture, "The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us." Now, save is here used in the sense of pardon. There stands faith in the Son of God, but belief alone does not pardon a man. There stands repentance, before which no man can get to God, because he commands all men every where to repent; he also com-

mands you to be baptized, but baptism never changed a man's heart or feelings, or obtained pardon in itself, but it is a condition which God plainly demands, and it is a sin not to comply with it. Let all these conditions be complied with, and if the Word of the Infinite One can be relied on, you will be saved. If you get even one promise of his in that day, it will give you more strength and encouragement than all the reasons and sophisms that have been uttered by the preachers of the present century. O, come to Him, but come not in your own strength; come, not believing that your faith can save you, that repentance or obedience can rescue you; but come, complying with the conditions which God requires; cast thyself upon his mercies, saying, "Lord, I give myself to thee, 'tis all that I can do." I throw myself upon my Savior, and he will bring me to everlasting life and eternal enjoyment. When Peter, in the presence of an immense assembly, delivered his first gospel sermon on the day of Pentecost, he made but one proposition concerning our Lord Jesus Christ: "He in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily," says he, "is risen from the dead, and this day has been spoken of by the prophet Joel." When he had finished his speech, the crowd, from the deep fountains of their hearts, cried out, "What shall we do to be saved?" The apostle, in answer to that impor-

tant question, says, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Whenever my friend will give the same answer to the same question, I will grant that he is orthodox, I will grant that he is preaching the truth as it is in Jesus; but so long as he denies this doctrine which is so explicitly taught in the Bible, I can neither believe he is orthodox, scriptural, or sound in the faith.

But leaving this passage, I want to call your attention to another consideration. My friend does not like the idea of there being so much human instrumentality connected with baptism. He has paid no kind of respect to what I said about human instrumentality in preaching the gospel. There is no more human instrumentality in the administration of the ordinance of baptism, in the New Testament, than there is in preaching the gospel of the Living God. There is nothing irrational or inconsistent in all this; but still the gentleman can not see how baptism must be a condition, when we are all justified by faith. I was about to commence an illustration of this when the moderators' fast watch stopped me. I was once with a preacher that some friends here are acquainted with, holding a protracted meeting. We had a conversation of an hour with a gentleman who had been trying to enlighten my friend on the subject of justification by faith alone. We walked

over his farm, and getting on a fence, looked over a beautiful field. Says he, "This field produced me this year seventy-five bushels to the acre." As we went homeward we met a very fine horse. "That horse," said the owner, pointing to him, "raised that field of corn you saw." We next came to a shed, under which was a plow. "Do you see that plow?" says he; "well, it raised that field of corn." As we were approaching the house we met his sons. "These boys," says the man, "raised that field of corn by themselves." "Well," said my friend, when we went into the house, "this gentleman has told me some of the strangest things I ever heard. He told us that the rich field alone, without horse, plow, boys, or any thing else, produced seventy-five bushels of corn to the acre. He then informed us that the horse alone raised it; and again, that the plow did it; and again, to cap the climax, said that the boys, without the aid of land, horse, plow, or any thing else, produced the stated amount of grain." Now, when the man said the ground produced seventy-five bushels per acre, he knew we had sense enough to know, or to infer, that the horse, plow, &c., were included; and also, when he spoke of each separate implement as having accomplished the work, of course he knew we would infer that it did not raise the grain of itself. In precisely the same way God proceeds

in addressing his intelligent creatures about salvation. He does not stop to put in the love of Christ, baptism, the grace of God, and all this; but he proceeds upon the hypothesis that we will infer that all of these conditions are necessary, because they are all mentioned, though in different places. When he speaks of faith, he does not exclude repentance; and when discoursing on repentance, baptism is not excluded, because the spirit of the gospel declares its utility and commands its performance, and the injunction must be unhesitatingly obeyed, if we wish to realize our hopes of pure, glorious, and everlasting enjoyment. Is there any thing irrational in this? No, my friend. If there is any thing beautiful beneath the shining sun; if there is any thing calculated to ennoble man's nature, expand his heart, and elevate his mind, it is this benevolent system of God. Let us just take one glance at the entire process, all of which originated in his love. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life." What was that gift? Paul says, 2 Cor. viii. 9, "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich."

The Spirit of God produces a divine change

in the heart of the sinner. He says: "I hate sin, and will turn away from it; I love my Savior, I believe in the holy Bible; but I will not stop to discuss the question whether baptism is essential or not; if God in his wisdom has commanded it, I will submit to it without hesitation, and will walk in newness of life. I should like to know what prejudice any man can start up against this?"

My friend has been inquiring whether I was ever a Baptist. It was my good fortune to be nothing but simply a Christian. If there is any thing under the heavens I thank God for, it is that I was never converted to any thing but our Lord Jesus Christ. I was never converted to any thing but Christianity, as God gave it. I have no system to defend; I have no theory to promulgate. I do not know what distinguished reformers have said, but I know what the Holy Spirit has spoken—what the revelation from God to man teaches, and that I shall be judged by Jesus Christ according to the gospel. If you want to know that you are in Christ, behold the Word of the Living God. When you take the steps, when you comply with the explicit commands therein laid down, then you know that you are in; you will not feel that you are a Christian because you rejoice, but you will *know* that you are one. There is as much difference between the system of

Christianity as God gave it, and the blind, confused, mysterious systems which my friend has been trying to explain to this audience, as there is between the sun and darkness. One is light; in the other you go *feeling* your way along, and all your evidence is merely the evidence of *feeling*. The first has an additional advantage over the other, because he has not only the same powers of feeling, but the light of truth also. My friend is wandering in the dark; he can not see clearly, and you must not expect him to make matters plain. But it is not my friend's fault so much as that of the system which he advocates, and you will excuse him when you consider what a herculean task he is laboring under while he is trying to find proof-passages which do not exist in the Bible. You must not blame him if he can not find a single passage in God's Word to prove that a man was ever pardoned before he was baptized. God never intended he should teach such a system, and, therefore, never gave him any foundation upon which to build it up. My friends, I want you to settle distinctly in your own minds the question at issue: Is baptism for the remission of sins, or is it not for the remission of sins? The apostle Peter says it is—"Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins;" and, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the king-

dom of God;" and, "Whereunto baptism doth also now save us," &c. The Lord said, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." The apostle says, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." When the Ethiopian nobleman said to Philip, "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" Philip said, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." And he answered and said, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Peter then baptized him, but he did not rejoice until *after* he was baptized. I want you to keep all the good feelings, all the change of heart, and all the piety that you are now possessed of, and also to keep on praying; but remember, at the same time, that you must not omit one syllable—let every thing stand in precisely the same order in which God has placed it, and you will be saved in this world and the world to come. But he says that we are in danger! Has *he* faith that we have not? Does the Baptist Church know of any sounder doctrine than we have? We believe with all our heart that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and in the entire revelation of the Spirit of the Living God. Has he any repentance that we have not? We hold that a man should be sorry for all his sins, and turn away from them. Does he speak of a change of heart—we hold the theory of a change of heart as divine as he

can possibly describe. God knows we desire the heart to be purified by faith. Does he believe in immersion—so do we. Does he believe in the promise that you shall receive the Holy Spirit—so do we. And I ask, in the name of reason, of what has he to boast, except he claims pardon before baptism? But he can not find one single passage, from the day of Pentecost to the end of the New Testament, where it speaks of a believer being pardoned before baptism. The only advantage is, that he is completely mistaken in this entire matter. I ask, then, where is his vantage ground? He says he believes in prayer. Well, I want you to pray, and keep praying until your eyes are opened to see the truth. I say to my Baptist brethren here (and God knows I can speak it from the bottom of my heart), that there is not one of their number on top of this earth for whom I entertain any but the most Christian regard and affection. God knows, I take no pleasure in wounding any of their feelings. My brother exhorts you to pray. You can not pray too often; but I beg of you, in God's name, when you want to tell the sinner what he shall do to be saved, quote the Scriptures to him without any equivocation, prevarication, or hesitation, and show him the way into the kingdom of God. If there is any thing I hope and pray for, it is that our Baptist brethren may disregard these

petty distinctions, which are only calculated to engender and nourish schisms among those born to be brothers. And while of the same capacities, of the same judgment, and speaking the same language, let us speak in the language of the Living God, and go for the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; and with the mighty arm of Jehovah to protect us, we will go on advancing and defending the cause of our gracious Master. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FISHER'S FIFTH REPLY.]

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

With but two exceptions, my opponent has introduced nothing in his last speech which was not in the preceding ones—he having repeated that speech five times in your hearing. One of the new things is what a little girl said in relation to my not having produced a single passage in proof of remission of sins. I hope the dear little girl will read the debate when it is published, and she will find that she is egregiously mistaken. I hope my friend promised her five cent's worth of candy, for she undoubtedly saw that "Jordan was a hard road to travel;" and, hearing his heart knocking against his ribs, and seeing his courage fail him in the hour of need, her kind little heart sympathized with him.

He next brought forward a field of corn, a plow, a horse, and two or three boys, saying that was like my system; and then, after having made that assertion, he took the same beautiful figure of speech to prove the truth of his system. Now, if it proves the truth of his system, and it is just like my system, of course his system is just like mine.

As my contentent has introduced in his last speech no new matter relevant to the proposition under discussion, I will present the case of Saul of Tarsus, and I think I will present a pretty fair Christian. My friend says there can be no such thing as an unbaptized Christian. His assertion reminds me very much of a good old preacher, who once said, "Brethren, God will always save his own elect—did I say always?—*most generally, brethren.*" His proposition is that baptism is always for the remission of sins—did he say always?—*most generally!* I believe that a man may be a Christian before baptism—*most generally.*

When my hour expired I had come to the history of Paul, given in the ninth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. I showed, in the first place, that he was convicted; that he was a praying man; that he was a chosen vessel of the Lord. In the second place, I showed that he was filled with the Holy Spirit before baptism. This is a history which every one can

read. Saul was convicted by the light and by the voice which proceeded from the cloud; in the house of Judas he was engaged in prayer — but my opponent would not teach an individual to pray to God for pardon before baptism. Here, then, you see that Paul was a praying man—had been chosen by the Lord as a vessel of mercy to carry the truth to the Gentiles. Now, if Paul was filled with the Holy Ghost, tell me where were his sins? If this glass is full of water, it is not full of dirt. Can this glass be full of water and full of dirt at the same time? Could Paul be filled with sin before baptism, and likewise with the Holy Spirit? Is it not strange that the Holy Spirit would consent to dwell in such a filthy temple as he was? You find, in all that is said about Paul, baptism is the very last. Now, sir, this is the kind of conversion I want. I want men convicted, because they are sinners in the sight of God. Paul had his altar of prayer in the house of Judas; I have mine wherever I kneel, and my friend may have his just where he pleases. Paul prayed to the Lord, and he was filled with the Holy Ghost. Now, tell me that such a man as this was not pardoned, that he was not purified, and that he did not possess the remission of his sins! It is preposterous!!

If you please, we will take a stronger case, if possible, than any which has been mentioned

since the commencement of this debate. In Acts x. is to be found the key which unlocks this whole mystery. It is Peter's third discourse after he preached that memorable sermon on the day of Pentecost. Will my friend take the ground that Peter preached two gospels—one to the Jews, and another to the Gentiles—seven years after the day of Pentecost? Will he accuse Peter of such gross inconsistency? I will ask my friend two questions, to which I again demand categorical answers. First: Did Peter preach the gospel of Jesus Christ upon the authority of God, or upon his own? In the second place: Did God grant repentance unto life to the Gentiles; and if he did, were their sins remitted by faith in Jesus Christ, or in the bodily act of baptism? The second question my opponent has answered in the *Christian Review*, vol. 2, Cincinnati, April, 1857, page 115: "I preach that baptism is for remission of sins, and come forward and affirm it without equivocation." Then you will see that it was not by repentance toward God and faith in Jesus Christ, but by baptism, according to the system of my opponent. What a fearful responsibility such preaching incurs. Now, I will show from Peter's preaching, that the Gentiles obtained the remission of their sins before baptism. And what is true of them is true of every believer who has gone or will go to heaven; consequently

my opponent and his brethren are deluded upon the subject of baptism for the remission of sins. Now, to the law and the testimony: Cornelius was a centurion of the Italian band; he was a devout man, and gave alms to the poor; and he was a praying man. At the ninth hour of the day, an angel came to him and told him that his prayers and alms had come up as a memorial before God, and that he must send to Joppa for Peter, who would tell him words whereby he and all his were to be saved. When Peter was on the house top, about the sixth hour, he had a vision, which told him to go to the house of Cornelius, which he accordingly did. He found Cornelius waiting for him, and he preaches the gospel which had been published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee after the baptism which John preached. The burden of his speech was the birth, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and that he was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead. Says Peter, in the 43d, 46th, and 48th verses, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word, and they of the circumcision, which believed, were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that, on the Gentiles was also poured out the gift

of the Holy Ghost, for they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. Then answered Peter, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Now, my beloved hearers, from the history of Cornelius I prove these facts: In the first place, that Cornelius was a praying man, a benevolent man. In the second place, I prove that he had received remission of sin by repentance toward God, and faith in Jesus Christ; and in the third place, I prove that upon him was poured out the Holy Spirit before baptism. From these facts, you plainly see that the Gentiles believed in Jesus of Nazareth, consequently received the remission of sins; and after being born, they were sealed with the Spirit of God. Now, says Peter, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. From Peter's preaching and defense, we gather these facts which I have already named in your hearing. Now, did the Gentiles believe—did they repent? "What," says Peter, in Acts xi. 18, "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." Then they were in the possession of new and spiritual life, and as a matter of course, were not dead in trespasses and sin. Did the Gentiles believe? Acts x. 43:

“To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.” Again in xv. 9: “And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith.” Now the argument is this: The Gentiles repented, therefore they possessed newness of life, and were born of God, for John says, in his first epistle, 5th chap. 1st verse—“Whosoever believeth that Jesus is Christ, is born of God.” The Gentiles believed—then they were justified in the sight of God before baptism, for Paul says in Rom. v. 1, “Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.” They were justified believers, they had received the Holy Spirit, they spake with tongues, hence it was their duty to be baptized upon a profession of their faith in the blessed Redeemer. And what is true of the Gentiles, is equally true of the Jews. Did not they believe that Jesus was the Christ; therefore, were they not born of God? My opponent says, we cannot be justified in our sins. Who says we can? We must be pardoned, or we can not be justified by faith; and his assertion that we have no system of forgiveness, is nothing but a threadbare assertion.

But imperfect as our system is, in the estimation of our friend, I will prove by his own conduct, that it is equal to his. A man comes

forward to the mourners' bench, he professes the pardon of his sins, is baptized upon a profession of his faith in Jesus Christ, but he afterwards changes his opinion in relation to doctrinal points—thinks he can live more comfortably with the Reformationists than with his Baptist brethren, and he goes into their house of worship, and they receive him upon the faith, repentance, and pardon which he received at the altar of prayer. Suppose my friend baptizes a person for the remission of sins, and he afterwards wishes to join the Baptist Church, we will not receive him, because he was baptized with a wrong design. Does not this plainly show, my beloved hearers, that our coin is more genuine than that of my friend? Our coin is current with him, but his is not with us. How can it be possible that our system is so heterodox, when he will receive into the bosom of his society individuals professing religion at the altar of prayer, and when some minister of the gospel was engaged in praying to God for the forgiveness of their sins? Is it not true that some of their best members—yes, nine-tenths of the best in the society of Disciples—are those who have gone from the Baptist Church? Mr. Campbell, with all his physical and mental strength, proclaims the doctrine that baptism is for the remission of sins,—that no man is justified—no man is pardoned—no

man is adopted—no man is sanctified—before baptism. Yet Mr. Campbell was never baptized for the remission of his sins! Mr. Campbell was baptized by Mathias Luce, a Baptist minister, in 1812 (I do not know whether he was as loose in faith as his name implies). He was baptized upon a profession of his faith—a wrong design, for he says, “that baptism is for the remission of sins, and the design nullifies the institution and ordinance of baptism.” Well, Mr. Campbell certainly does not believe that baptism can be for the remission of sins; for, if so, he does not practice what he preaches, which proves one of two things: either that he puts no faith in his dogma, or that he is too much engaged in looking after the souls of others to pay attention to his own, and while showing

—————“The steep and thorny road to heaven,
Himself the primrose path of dalliance treads,
And recks not his own road.”

Why not make baptism, as some divines do, the washing of regeneration; then regeneration would exist before baptism by a metonymical form of speech. Sometimes the sign is put for the thing signified, as in John iii. 5—water before the birth of the Spirit—one term for another,—so the figure, “whereunto baptism doth also now save us,” is a symbol of our salvation by faith in Jesus Christ. We are saved, not in fact, only in figure; and, if the washing

of regeneration, by baptism, be a metonymical form of speech, and washing is put before regeneration, let us have it so. Is it not plain to every man's mind that regeneration existed before washing? Did washing bring it into existence, and did it not exist before? Does baptism produce regeneration? Mr. Campbell says, that "born of water and of the Spirit, and regeneration, are bible names for the same thing." Then men who are born of water are regenerated. He will have men born before they are begotten! Simon Magus was born of water, yet he was never begotten by the word of truth. Born without being begotten? What an anomaly in God's universe! Now, why not make baptism an emblem of the remission of our sins, by faith in the blood of Jesus Christ? Why not have it as Paul had it? Why not be converted as the Gentiles were? Were the Jews converted differently from the Gentiles? My beloved hearers, do you presume my opponent would baptize a man who came forward and said he did not love God? Would he baptize him in order to make him love God? No sir; he would not do it! John says, in his first epistle, chapter iv. 7, "Beloved, let us love one another, for love is of God; and every one that loveth, is born of God, and knoweth God." Not every one that is baptized, but every one that loveth, is born of God. Again in iii. 14: "We

know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." Will my opponent baptize a man for the remission of his sins who has already passed from death unto life, and thus give the lie to the Holy Spirit? The apostle does not say, We know that we have passed from death unto life, because our heart is changed, because our character is changed, or because our state is changed! These unmeaning phrases, which my opponent has strung together, are nowhere to be found within the lids of God's precious Book. He has fixed them up for his own purpose, or for the purpose of those who are inveigled into his faith. The Bible says the blind that lead the blind shall both fall into the ditch. "We know that we have passed from death unto life," not because we have been baptized, not because our character or state have been changed, but *because we love the brethren*. Have I not, from these passages, proved beyond successful contradiction, that repentance and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, are instruments of pardon, which is but another name for remission, synonymous with being born of God? Have I not shown that Paul was converted before baptism, that the Gentiles received the remission and pardon of their sins before baptism? Did not Jesus Christ convert people—did he not remit their sins? yet he never baptized any. Did he

not, upon the cross, forgive the sins of the dying thief, who went to heaven without baptism? Simon Magus was baptized upon a profession of the same kind of faith for which you contend, and Peter pronounced him to be in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity. Peter charged upon him that his heart was not right in the sight of God, and if my opponent's position is true, did not Paul do the strangest preaching that any person ever heard? for he, in no instance, preached baptism to the church at Ephesus—never mentioned the very act by which their state was changed; and yet, did he not show and declare unto them the whole counsel of God? He said that Christ sent him, not to baptize, but to preach the gospel; therefore baptism must have been regarded of minor importance when compared with preaching. And if preaching the gospel was of more importance than baptism, then baptism cannot be for the remission of sins. And if baptism is for the remission of sins, why, then, it is of more importance than preaching the gospel. But my contentent will doubtless look upon this as blasphemy. He can find no instance upon record that Paul baptized any but Crispus and Gaius, and the household of Stephanus. Though he declared the whole counsel of God, he did not preach baptism for the remission of sins. Now, from the history of Paul's conversion, his

preaching, and from thousands who have gone to heaven without being baptized, I say that baptism is *not* for the remission of sins. I can produce instances where newness of life is connected with faith alone; where repentance, justification, and remission of sin, is connected with faith alone; but can my opponent produce one single instance where pardon, remission, or adoption, is connected with baptism alone? No, he can not do it.

My friend says he is not responsible for any consequences which may result from his doctrines! As we are summing up some facts, I just want to show you how liberal my friend's proposition is, and how very benevolent he becomes when he says he is not responsible for consequences. A man may have a divine change of heart, of character, and of feeling, but if he is not baptized for a change of *state*, as a matter of course, according to the theory of my opponent, he must be lost. He is not responsible for the consequences of his doctrine, yet he believes, in the plentitude of his benevolence, that some Pedobaptists will go to heaven. Well, how do they get to heaven without the remission of their sins, for which they have never been baptized? How do they get into Christ? By being baptized into him? Well, then, there are thousands of Pedobaptists in heaven, yet they are out of Christ, because they have never

been baptized into Christ—they have never put him on by baptism. My opponent's speeches remind me very much of the sermon of an old African brother, who said, "Young massas, you have all come out to hear a poor nigger preach. You all know that a man of fulgential intellectualities, and bodiatorial corporosities, can pour it out sometimes most stentonifornically with mortigriptions energy."

I have presented a monumental pillar of divine truth, which will stand amid the fires and thunders of the last day. Here we have given to the breeze the lone-starred banner of the Cross. Here we have shown, from the teachings of the ever-blessed Spirit, that a man is born again when he gives the evidence of his change by repentance toward God, faith in Jesus Christ, and love to God and to his people. If a man had only five minutes to live, he would try to say all that he had to say in that length of time, and as I have but a few moments remaining, I will try to say all that can be said in refutation of this absurd doctrine. What has been the effect upon the world of this popish error of baptismal regeneration? Look at the Catholic Church: they have regenerated by their infant baptism almost every member belonging to it; and the Episcopal Church is made up almost entirely of those who are regenerated in the act of infant baptism. And

so the Mormons (I do not mention them invidiously in connection with the Episcopalians), do they not baptize for the remission of their sins; and not only once, but as often as the case demands? and my opponent should do the same whenever any of his brethren apostatize, for if baptism would, in the first instance, remit the sins of one who had repented of them and believed in Jesus Christ, will it not remit the sins afterwards committed, if he has the very same kind of repentance and faith? What is the history of the once current Reformation which commenced in 1828? Look at it in some parts of our country. Where it once flourished, its name has become extinct. It only lives upon the pages of some pamphlet, or in some dream of sorrow; and I might give some glorious examples of its effects. Those who have been baptized upon a profession of their faith, will be received as gladly into the society of the Disciples as though they had been baptized for the remission of their sins. This is a stubborn fact, which our friends cannot deny. Would to God that all their eyes were open so that they might see the truth in all its purity, — in its diamond purity, resplendent with the effulgent sheen from God's eternal throne — that they might be robed in the righteousness of Jesus Christ, and walk in humble obedience to the commands of God. Now, sir, in the

Reformation I have many friends, dear friends, whom I love, and I believe there are many pious Christians in the society; but I do not believe that one of them was ever made a Christian by the kind of change of heart, of feelings, of state, that my opponent has been advocating upon this occasion. Every Christian among them has either gone from some other society, or from the Church of Jesus Christ. Some may have repented of their sins before baptism, and been justified by faith in Jesus Christ; and such should come out and confess it before men, and be baptized upon a profession of their faith: and those who have been baptized upon a profession of their faith, should come out from those who have been baptized for remission of their sins, and live with their brethren of the same faith. Overturn these arguments, and you overturn the universe. [*Time expired.*]

END OF THE FIRST PROPOSITION.

DEBATE

ON THE

DOCTRINE OF DEPRAVITY.

PROPOSITION SECOND.

Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine of total, hereditary depravity? Mr. Fisher affirms—Mr. Franklin denies.

SATURDAY, JUNE 6, 10 o'clock, A. M.

[MR. FISHER'S OPENING ADDRESS.]

Brethren Moderators:

I cannot proceed without some explanation, for I should feel degraded in my own estimation were I to let this public reprimand, upon the part of my venerable brother, pass without making some extenuating remarks. I am charged by one of the moderators with having violated one of the rules by which we were to be governed in this debate—that is, introducing new matter upon the final negative of the first proposition. If language means any thing, and if we are capable of understanding terms as

defined by lexicographers, I would ask, in the name of sacred justice and of truth, what this sentence means, penned by my learned and worthy opponent: "On the final negative no new matter shall be introduced?" Is not that the last negative in the debate? What does *final* mean, but the last? The final negative of three propositions, means the last negative of the final proposition. I say I have not violated that rule, with due deference to what the venerable moderator has said.

Mr. Franklin. I do not like to be put down by a little reference to lexicographers, in this kind of style, and will take the liberty to express my understanding of this language. My first reply was *negative*, but it was not the *final* negative. The second was also negative, but the last of his speech was the final negative of this proposition, and the one in which the rule was designed to inhibit any new matter, and no sophistry under heaven can possibly get him out of it.

Mr. Fisher. I understand it—no new matter shall be introduced on the final, which is the last negative in the debate. I leave it to a jury of infidels if I have violated that rule.

Mr. Franklin. If that was brother Fisher's understanding of it, it exonerates him entirely; it is a sufficient explanation of the whole matter.

Mr. Fisher. I would just observe, that if my worthy opponent and his brethren are not satisfied, he may now reply to the speech I made last night, and we will go on discussing this proposition until he and his brethren are perfectly satisfied.

Mr. Franklin said he did not care about replying to the final negative on the proposition. He had nothing more to say about it, only that it was out of order.

Mr. Fisher then said: Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen,—Having assumed the affirmative on the second proposition of this debate, it is my duty to make the opening speech. I come before you this morning to discuss one of the most momentous subjects that ever engaged the pens and the tongues of mortals. I have come to show you that the being whom God made upright, upon whose soul he enstamped his own living image, which consisted in righteousness, truth and holiness—that being who dwelt amid the elysian bowers of Eden, and gazed upon the beauty of the earth and the grandeur of the jeweled heavens, the rolling up of the sun in his golden car, and the moon walking amid the jewelry of the skies—fountains gushing all around him, and birds caroling their lays responsive to the harps of angels in praise to their Creator,—I have come to show you, that this complex being, occupying

the summit of creation, and lord of the fowls and beasts, is a total ruin—a mighty ruin; yet I would say, splendid in his misery, and still majestic in his ruin! I have nothing apart from what inspired historians have said in relation to man as he was, as he is, and what he may be, if he ever treads the gold-paved streets of the New Jerusalem, or climbs the sun-bright steeps of immortality, or, soaring into the companionship of angels around the throne of God, grasps destinies as unbounded as eternity, and claims infinity as his home. Let me be silent and hear the God of heaven, through his selected instruments, make known man's nature.

Before introducing the testimony by which I will prove my position—yes, *prove* it, is what I intend to do—the Lord being my helper, it shall not go by default. I will prove it if there is truth in this sacred book; I will prove it, unless the lips of heaven have practiced a fraud upon me, and I presume that there is not one in this assembly who would dare to say that this volume is not the oracle of Jehovah's immaculate lips. I will give you, in the first place, a definition of total hereditary depravity, and I hope my friend will keep his eye upon this definition. But he has very little use for lexicons in this debate. If he understood, or would understand, the definition as given by Walker and Webster, of the term total hereditary

depravity; if he would take what they have said, I opine there would be but little difficulty between us upon this important subject. Almost every dispute, and all differences which have existed between individuals upon this, and I might add, upon every other subject, has originated from an incorrect understanding of terms. What does Walker say about total hereditary depravity? How does he define the term? If he has not correctly defined it, it becomes my opponent to show that his definition is incorrect, and he should revise Walker's definition upon total hereditary depravity, as he has so learnedly revised portions of God's holy word, or put criticisms into the mouths of revisers who are now engaged in doing the work. But I may be too fast, as some of the translators were selected from the Disciples. He may be a reviser himself, and if he is not, it is astonishing to me that the Bible Union overlooked— [Order.] I mean nothing invidious or mordacious, but rather complimentary. Well, I would say that the Bible Union has overlooked the transcendental abilities of your humble servant and my worthy opponent. [Laughter.] Now, Walker says the term total means whole, complete, not divided. That is what I understand the depravity of man to be—that he is wholly depraved, that he is completely depraved, that his depravity is not divided, and that

he is an entire moral ruin. We do not mean by total depravity that man is one unvaried mass of corruption and putrefaction, neither do we mean that he is not capable of adding sin to sin—but we mean by the term total hereditary depravity, that man's heart, by nature, is destitute of the image of the living God, of love to God, and of all truth and virtue. My opponent may object to the term total, because it is not found within the lids of the Bible. I will grant that the word total, in reference to depravity, is not found therein; I will concede to my learned opponent that much. As a scholar and a critic, I want him to keep his eye upon the definition which I have read from Walker, that total means whole, that it means complete, that it means not divided; consequently, the term whole is synonymous with total: the total quantity of any thing is the whole quantity, and *vice versa*. The total number of individuals attending this debate is the whole number—the entire number. Now, hear what the divine historian has to say in proof of this position, in the first chapter of Isaiah, 5th and 6th verses: “Why should ye be stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more: the whole head is sick and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head, there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrefying sores: they

have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment." The whole head means the entire head, every part, the total number of parts that go to make up the whole head, for the whole is equal to the parts, and *vice versa*, the parts are equal to the whole. What is true of the head is also true of the heart. The head is the dome of thought; there sits the soul enthroned, and through its windows, the eyes, it looks out upon all that is beautiful in this world, and grand in the heavens above, as they bend their blue arch over this sin-cursed world. The heart is the seat of the affections, and in this palace the prince of the power of the air has entered; he sits armed cap-a-pie; there he sits luxuriating amid the ruin which his arm has wrought; there he sits with the soul chained to his chariot wheels; there he sits and does his work in the hearts of the children of disobedience. His whole heart is faint; every part of it is faint. All its affections, all of the passions of men are in subjection to the enemy of souls. Man's will is no longer in diapason or in harmony with the will of God, but he is led a willing captive, if the Bible is true, by the will of the devil. The heart is entirely sick, not *partially indisposed*, as my opponent will doubtless assume. Nothing but wounds—as the graphic evangelical prophet changes the figure—nothing but

“wounds, bruises and putrefying sores.” Yes, he is sick: there is no soundness in him, no goodness; by nature a fearful monument of the displeasure of God, who looks upon him as having broken one of the most humane laws that the Author of the universe ever announced. Having created a garden with flowers and fruits, birds and fountains, in which he might luxuriate, where love reigned immortal; pointing out to him one tree—placing his interdict upon it, placing him under a covenant of works, free to stand, yet at liberty to fall, having every motive to keep him in the path of obedience and rectitude;—but, in that fatal hour, the tempter, the wily serpent, the apostate foe of God and man, enters into the Eden of man’s happiness and enjoyment, and by his wiles, persuades mother Eve—that lovely being, upon whom the angels looked with admiration, robed in innocence, all joy to her heart and all music to her ear—the devil persuades her to put forth her hand and pluck the fruit of this interdicted tree. Having done it, she persuades her companion to perpetrate the like crime. That very moment he became convicted—yes, the soul was stripped of its pristine glory, and its primeval holiness departed; the jeweled sceptre fell from the hand of man; the diadem faded upon his brow; the guilty pair are covered with shame and confusion; in vain they try

to hide from their Creator, in blooming bowers. God Almighty gazes upon them with compassion, and even the angels in heaven look down upon them with pity as they gazed upon the mighty ruin; as they saw leaflet and flower fade before the simoon breath of sin; as they saw man a guilty wanderer from God. In this forlorn condition, God, in the plentitude of his benevolence, with a spirit of philanthropy, which He alone could possess, promised them an entire deliverer, not a partial savior, but a whole savior, who should come, gather up these scattered fragments, remove the stain of sin, and re-entstamp his entire image upon the face of man's soul; not a *partial* image, for the whole image had faded, but an *entire* image. Jesus has promised to come and reinstate man, and to place him under a covenant of grace, from which, as we will show before this discussion ends, he can never fall or apostatize. Let the devil now come and do his best, and prevail, if he can, upon man to again swerve from his allegiance. If it is possible that he ever can or ever does, no other Son of God will leave the shining courts of glory. Jesus will not again come down from the grand and lofty heavens to tread the earth with his footsteps, and baptize it in his blood and tears. No! man will go, driven by the thunders of God Almighty's wrath, and swept by the hurricane of His vengeance, down

to that world where he will meet with none so poor, so low, and mean, as to do him reverence. Sirs, if there is meaning in words or language—if Bible testimony is good evidence with my opponent, he is a whole moral ruin, and to say that he is not, would be to impeach the character of the evangelical prophet, whose heart was ever strung and tuned to the praise of God. Yes, the sweet notes of that harp were responsive to the jeweled harps of the living millions who bend before the Godhead in all its unveiled splendor and diamond beauty.

My opponent may try to urge, in his learned way,—for I concede that my opponent is a learned man—I concede that he is a great man—I concede all that his friends claim for him—I would not, by any means, disparage him or any argument of his by wit or sophistry that I might use,—I say he will urge that the term “total” is not found in the lids of the Bible, when I have shown you a synonymous term, a word of the same import. But, if he takes this position, I will drive him into a dilemma upon some other matters, from which he never will be able to extricate himself. Do you desire evidence other than that which I have already produced? If you do, it is at hand, like the kingdom of heaven, when John stood preaching the gospel. Here it is; I have it like the money which I owe any man; it is at hand, in

my possession; he shall have it. Now to the testimony upon this important subject. I was to prove that man was not only totally depraved, but also that this depravity was hereditary. I have established the first branch of my position; but I wish my opponent to understand that I do not intend, by any means, to bring forward, in proof of this important point, as many facts as he can carry from Ghent to the city of Cincinnati. What do we mean by hereditary depravity? What is meant by hereditary? Are not some diseases considered hereditary and transmissible from parent to child? For instance, like produces like; the father and mother that were lepers, had offspring that were likewise lepers. Is not the same rule true in relation to pulmonary consumption, that, where the parents are consumptive, their children are also diseased? They come into the world with the seeds of this disease in their bodies, which they have inherited from their parents. Every axiom laid down in the laws of nature is upon this basis—that like produces like. Seth, the son of Adam, was not like God; he was not born into this world bearing the image of his Creator, but he was like his fallen parent, without God's image, without holiness, and devoid of righteousness. And that little adder that my opponent may gather up here from beneath his feet—yes, that little thing which

appears so harmless, so innocent—he may put it into his bosom, warm it, caress and play with it, and make a toy of it—yea, even convert it into a household god, as some of the ancients did when they worshiped serpents. Well, now, will he say that that little adder does not possess the same nature of the old serpent which brought it into existence? He would not put it to his bosom for the wealth of the State of Kentucky; he would not carry it; he would shun it through fear of the virus it carries concealed in a little sack at the root of its fangs! And that sweet little babe, just born into the world—its lovely lips would almost tempt a kiss from the angels from the shining heavens that bend in beauty over its cradle; the smile of seeming innocence and purity plays upon its lovely cheek; the roseate hue of heaven tinges it with a vermillion that has its parallel in the skies, where God lives and reigns. What would he say of the nature of this lovely little one? Will he say that it does not possess the nature of its parents; that it has not in embryo, in miniature, all the passions of the adult? Why, my opponent will say, if this doctrine of hereditary depravity is true, we will have to suffer for Adam's sin. I have made no such proposition as that. But the child *does* suffer because Adam sinned. There is a great difference, my beloved hearers, in an

individual suffering for another's crime, and suffering because another was guilty of crime. Adam must suffer for his own sin. God knows that my opponent and myself, together with every other man, have sins enough to answer for, without having to answer for Adam's sin. But my opponent does know that we suffer, and have suffered, because Adam sinned. Do infants come into the world like Adam was created? Have I not shown you, in the case of Seth, the son of Adam, that it is not the case. Do they not come into the world the subjects of death? Why, death is part of the penalty Adam incurred by putting forth the hand of disobedience. Why do infants die, and why do mothers weep over the remains of their sweet little ones, as they pass the stormy river of death? Why does that mother weep a shower of tears upon the cold form of her child, pressed in a delirium of anguish to her throbbing bosom, while her heart-strings are parting one by one? Sin has been the cause of this ruin which lies before the mother's eyes, and, like the chilling breath of untimely frosts, withers the bud as well as the blossom. Sin entered into the world, and death by sin. This little one inherited death—yes, death has been transmitted from generation to generation. But I know my opponent will attempt to evade the force of this argument by bringing up the case of John

the Baptist, saying that he was sanctified from his mother's womb. Well, if this proves any thing, it will prove too much for my opponent; therefore, it will prove precisely the very doctrine for which I am contending. Why fill that heart with the Holy Ghost, from its mother's womb, when it is already pure? Where is the necessity of this sanctification, of filling the heart of the infant harbinger of the Son of God, who preached the gospel of Jesus years after at the Jordan, and who led into its pellucid waters the Savior and the repentant Jews? Does not this prove that his heart was not full of the Holy Spirit before it was filled? Does it not prove that it was not full by nature—that it was not born full—that it was afterwards filled?

Having made these few remarks, I have only time enough to introduce another proof of the doctrine of total hereditary depravity, from the lips of one whom, I presume, stands upon an equal footing with some of the witnesses that I have already introduced. We will turn to the *Christian Baptist*, No. 8, vol. vi., and hear what the great Reformer of Bethany, Brooke county, Virginia, has to say—that modern Colossus in literature and theology—a man who has walked out of the reeling and rocking temple of Babylon—left behind him its stench, smoke, blood, dead mens' bones and putrid carcasses, and gone out to stand amid the refulgent sun-

rise of a glorious reformation, whose reign is never to close! Hear what he says: "All persons are born children of wrath." What, do my eyes deceive me? Has my amanuensis practiced a fraud upon me? *All* persons, of course, means the total number of persons in the world. So the depravity is not only hereditary, but universal! How comprehensive! All persons are born—not educated—children of wrath, else they never can become vessels of wrath. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FRANKLIN'S FIRST REPLY.]

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am happy to find my friend on the stage this morning, and apparently in good spirits and health; and his lungs, I believe, are tolerably strong. I find, too, that his cautiousness is increasing. He has proceeded more cautiously this morning than in any previous part of this discussion. He seems to apprehend that there are "sawyers" in the way. I hope we shall have an interesting interview upon this subject.

I want to first call your attention to the definitions of the terms. I do not like the attempt my friend has made to dodge and slip his shoulder from under the heavy corner of total hereditary depravity, and fix up a something

and call *it* total hereditary depravity. He has got to swallow down good old orthodox total hereditary depravity. He is not to make a new kind of depravity. But he affords you the intelligence this morning that I have no use for lexicons, and he could not get through his speech without at least one dozen back-handed flings about learning. I wonder who has made any claims about learning? I certainly made no pretensions, neither said whether I considered myself learned or unlearned. I found out, however, that there are some things *he* does not know yet. All his flings about learning are entirely uncalled for. I have given no occasion for one of them. I will read you, then, in the beginning, Webster's definition of depravity: "1, corruption, a vitiated state; 2, a vitiated state of the heart, wickedness, corruption of moral principles, destitution of holiness or good principles." Well, hear him now on the definition of hereditary. My friend had to take so many flights away in the heavens that he forgot to define hereditary, and to tell what it did mean. Hereditary: "1, that has descended from an ancestor; 2, that may descend from an ancestor to an heir, descendible to an heir at law; 3, that is or may be transmitted from a parent to a child." I will also read you Webster's definition of total: "1, whole, full, complete; 2, whole, not divided." Now, in

order to get hold of the subject fairly, we must go back to the definition of depravity, and see if it descends from the parent to the child — that little new-born infant that he describes so beautifully, and whose lips almost tempted a kiss from him. He says corruption has descended upon that new-born infant; but how he expects to escape the doctrine of infant damnation, I should like to hear him explain. You know he vindicated the right to bring up consequences, and that a man must be responsible for consequences which might result from his doctrine. Now, I want him to abide by his own logic. If new-born infants are corrupt at heart, if they are sinful, he must invent a system of infant regeneration, on the principle of infant baptism, and try to save infants from this infant corruption. I will also read him a definition I have here by Elder Joel Hume: “Depravity signifies corruption, a vitiated state of the heart, wickedness, corruption of the moral principles, destitution of holiness and good principles.” As it has no countenance from the Bible, so it has no foundation in the reason of things. The Scriptures bring down the children of wicked parents to the grave, and leave them there, and so I. The Scripture has not provided any resurrection for them, neither can I do it. Now, I have selected and read this merely for a kind of exponent of the position into which men run

who undertake to defend the doctrine of total hereditary depravity. The doctrine is not something that we are involved in on account of our transgressions, but it is something that descended upon us without our own volition, without our own will, actions, or consent. If we are not responsible, how can we be accountable? Whatever sin or evil consequences fall upon a man, on account of total hereditary depravity, he is involved in those consequences without any responsibilities of his own whatever. Now, while my friend was talking about the strength of this doctrine, and how little these infants were, I could not help thinking of one of the grandest expressions of our Lord and Master. They brought little children, and presented them to him, one by one. Some one upbraided them, but Jesus said: "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not,"—because they are totally depraved and corrupt! Is that the reason he gives? No; that is my brother's reason. God pitied the doctrine, and gave a better reason: "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." My friend's doctrine had never entered into the mind of our Redeemer. But this is not all. The Savior said, turning his attention toward adult persons: "Except *you* become as little children"—i. e., totally depraved and corrupt—"you can not

enter into the kingdom of heaven." Is not this doctrine of total hereditary depravity a most beautiful thing! Yes; the "little children are totally corrupt, from the sole of the head to the crown of the foot," or, as the gentleman afterwards corrected it, "from the crown of the foot to the sole of the head." [Laughter]. "Adult persons, you must repent, and become totally corrupt, or you can not enter into the kingdom of God." Now, brother Helm, is that good old-fashioned Baptist doctrine? Is that re-setting "the old land-marks?" Was that the work brother Fisher was engaged in when he made so many proselytes? Is this preaching the doctrine that little children are totally corrupt, and that adult persons must become as little children, re-setting these time-honored theological stakes? Why, it is a wonder to me how these adult persons expect to free themselves from their total corruption. My friend clears up his voice. I know this is a little severe on him, but I will try and perform the operation so as to produce as little pain as possible.

Mr. Fisher. Thank you.

Mr. Franklin. You are welcome. My friend labored his subject well, but whether his system is one of grace or not, I can not tell. There is one thing he defends, and that is, a system of works; and if he did not work hard and manfully, and talk and struggle for an

hour to get one single proof-text, I am deceived. And what makes it more singular is, that it was from his good old Baptist Bible—the one he uses when he goes to family prayers. He cut enough out of a passage, and pasted it in his book, to look as near like his doctrine as he could. Now, let us look at the passage—Isaiah i. 3: “The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master’s crib: but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider.” I think it was man, but the prophet is talking about Israel. There is a slight mistake in the pronoun. When the Lord is talking about Israel, he gets up to show the total hereditary depravity of man. It only relates to Israel. There is another difficulty in this passage, and that is my friend’s proposition, that depravity is hereditary. “Ah! sinful, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that are corruptors! they have forsaken the Lord; they have provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger; they have gone away backward.” They were not reprimanded for the Adamic sin—for hereditary corruption of heart,—but because they had themselves sinned; it was because they were a sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that were corruptors, who had forsaken the Lord and had provoked the Holy One of Israel unto anger; they went away backward—from what? From the total

corruption they were in when they were born? [A laugh.] What a splendid effort he makes in driving his doctrine. He told you in his last speech, last night (and I thought the comet had come), “you may as well overturn the pillars of the universe, as my argument.” Why did not brother Fisher cut this whole passage out, and paste it in his family prayer book? Because he discovered that the two verses of the prophet related only to the corruption of the Israelitish nation, who had departed and apostatized from the right way. And in calling your attention to this passage of Scripture, he has disproved his last proposition, for this is the passage which teaches the doctrine of falling from grace. I discover that brother Fisher has not quite sufficient perspicacity, for he takes one position that conflicts with another. One time he is on one side of the question—tries to prove the doctrine of total hereditary depravity, and gives a passage that does not say any thing about total or hereditary, but one which speaks of persons who are naturally corrupt, departing from the living God. He quotes one passage which disproves the other, and which shows that men turn from the holy commandments—that men can turn backward from God!

Well, I believe I am now through with the gentleman’s speech. I do not know any thing else I have to do, unless I go on and make a speech for

the edification of the audience, as set forth in the old orthodox works on total hereditary depravity. If there is any thing left of his speech, I should like to know what it is. As to the Icarian flights he made through the thin ether, sometimes so far that you could scarcely see him, I could not see whether that had any bearing on depravity or any thing else. I do not attempt to soar so high. I do not like these high flights. A man might get a fall once in a while. [A laugh.]

I agree with the gentleman, that the proposition is one of very considerable importance. It lies at the bottom of a question which has been discussed since the days of Augustine. Many Baptist theologians have fallen into this train, and vindicated the same doctrine; and all of them, in discussing this subject, take the position plainly, inflexibly, and without any hesitation, that the entire race, infants and all, are totally corrupt, that there is no good pertaining to them—there is nothing in them but a mass of corruption and putrefaction; and this is what my friend's proposition implies, when he will interpret it fairly. I want to look at this doctrine fairly and investigate it thoroughly, and want to lay before my friend a very clear and simple rule in argumentation, and that is, that no proof-text can possibly establish any proposition unless it contains the premises of

the proposition, or words equivalent to those terms. I should like to inquire why this rule has been violated so often. In what part of the gentleman's proof (he has but one) does he find the word *hereditary*—in what part does he find the word *total*, and in what part of it does he discover the word *depravity*? He has not, and I venture to say he will not, find one single passage containing any of the words of the proposition. But I want to allude to an admission of his. He says, total, in reference to depravity, is not found in the Bible. Do you know what gave him the trouble? Why, it was because none of the terms of his proposition are found in the Bible. Where did he get the proof? He went to the *Christian Baptist*, as long as the term was not found in the Bible; but he still failed to get the proof even in the *Christian Baptist*, which I do not consider as standard authority in this discussion. Leaving all this, however, I want to inquire, in the first place, in reference to the subject of total hereditary depravity. If total, as defined by Webster, does not imply as complete, as full, as perfect depravity as any thing possibly can be made, then, I confess, I understand nothing about the science of hermeneutics. That which is totally depraved is nothing but a mass of depravity, and there is no purifying that which is depraved. Suppose you had a mass of some matter that

was totally corrupt, you would commence some cleansing process: you would wash the corruption, keep purging, and, at last, what would you have? Why, the entire matter would be gone—nothing would remain. Well, my friend declares that man is totally depraved; there is nothing but corruption; there is no good quality in his organization; there is nothing valuable in him—no image of God, nothing but a perpetual mass of total corruption. Now, the first idea that entered into his head, is, that God so loved the world (the world is there used metonymically, for the church,—it is for the people, the inhabitants of the world—“a total mass of corruption”), that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever, of this mass of total corruption, believeth on him, may not perish, but have everlasting life. Now, all the observation I have to make in regard to this mass of total corruption, is, that if it is total, there can be no Christianity in it; and if such were the case, the apostle, in speaking of wicked men, could not have said as he did say, “they shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived.” Now, these were corrupt men, they were sinners, and God himself declares to them that they shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. But can that which is totally depraved wax worse and worse? The Devil is, I suppose, nothing but depravity, but

I have no account of his ever getting worse in his apostacy. He is at the lowest degree; he is as corrupt, as totally depraved as he can be; he can get no worse. But I wonder if my brother is prepared to stand up and look over this dense congregation, among which are numbers who have never been born of God, and say, "Gentlemen and Ladies, I pronounce you all upon a dead level: there is not one particle of difference in you; you are as totally corrupt as you can be; even the most refined, intelligent, moral, and upright unregenerated gentleman or lady here, is no better than the most debased, corrupt, and degraded creature that crawls upon the footstool of God." There is not a man here who believes any such a thing. There is a difference as broad as the heavens between those two characters. There are differences between men in the same state; one man may stand high, noble, and above another, but still both may be in a state of condemnation.

But perhaps my friend would like to have a little more Scripture. I can not help but season my argument pretty well with Scripture. I call his attention to 1 Cor. iii. Says Paul to you preachers of the gospel, "According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other

foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is." If I understand the apostle, he describes different classes of sins, and different classes of morals. But where do you get these morals? From brother Fisher's mass of total corruption? But Paul, in looking at men as they stand in an unconverted state, classifies them in six different degrees. The first class he compares to gold, and this is the very best class of morality among the unconverted and unregenerated. The next class he calls silver; and the next he classifies as precious stones. I believe the grammarians would say the precious stones are good, the silver is better, and the gold is best. Descending the other way, they would say, wood is bad, hay is worse, and stubble is worst. I believe this is about the order in which God has placed it. Now, will any man, after God has made this classification, insult his judgment by declaring that all men are upon a dead level of total corruption; that every unregenerated man in the community is totally corrupt, so that there can be no degrees of goodness, and that a man can neither become any better or worse outside of

the church? I wonder what he tells gentlemen when he tries to persuade them to join the Masons. I saw that he was cautioned about letting the secret out, which secret I do not know; but I wonder if he would not reason with him about the propriety of joining, and would say, "Though you are a man of the world, it will make you some better; it is a great institution, and the intention of it is to make men better. Come along, and join us." What! make a man better who is totally corrupt; and in an institution that has not the grace of God, that has not a particle of the blood of Jesus Christ in it? Make a man better in a state of corruption, when they can never be made any better until converted, until saved from that totally corrupted state by the supernatural power of God?

Brother Fisher has got into the wrong pew. Instead of standing among these Bible Union Baptists, he ought to be living with old brother Tom Dudley, Thompson, and some others who are preaching the doctrine that you are totally depraved, and can never have power to do any good until God shall put forth his irresistible power and save you. It all springs from the same root, it all branches from the same trunk, and is the embodiment of the same doctrine—beginning, middle, and end. Hecameto that passage—"Stand still, and through the salva-

tion of God," &c. Why, it is most astonishing to think that this Baptist church labors to convert sinners by having a gospel preached to them, which involves the idea that a man has no ability—that he can not understand—that he has no power to do any thing until operated upon by some irresistible power from heaven! He is certainly in the wrong pew, and out of the circle where he properly belongs. He should stand on that old do-nothing and can-do-nothing platform, and defend that doctrine which declares that every man is just what he is, from unavoidable necessity, and he can not be any thing else. I want to call your attention to these classifications I spoke of. Some man may say, "you are mistaken about there being different classes in an unregenerated state." Ah! well, I will read the parable of the sower: "A sower went out to sow his seed; and as he sowed, some fell by the way-side; and it was trodden down, and the fowls of the air devoured it. And some fell upon a rock; and as soon as it was sprung up, it withered away, because it lacked moisture. And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprang up with it, and choked it. And other fell on good ground, and sprang up, and bore fruit a hundred fold."—Luke viii. 5-8. Had the gentleman been there he would have said: "Stop, Master, there is no good ground; it is all totally corrupt; it is no

use to sow any seed there, for there is no good ground that can bring forth any thing; it will all be wasted." The idea of sowing the pure seed of the living God into ground that is totally corrupt—wholly repugnant to all that is good—is one of the grandest inconsistencies that has ever been advocated in the nineteenth century! We do not have to go to the Bible to get an explanation of this parable. The seed is the word of God, the field is the world, and the wasted ground is the man who gets away in the back part of the house, and the little he hears he does not understand. Now, if my brother preaches total depravity, will you say you can not understand until you are enlightened by the supernatural power of Jesus? He never preached that doctrine. He intended that we should understand and preach the *gospel*. The first class referred to in the parable are those who hear, but do not understand; the next are those who hear a little better, who receive the truth, but who afterwards lose it. The thorny ground refers to those who receive with gladness at first, but afterwards the weeds of avarice grow up and choke the word out of their hearts. There are three classes: the thorny soil is bad, the stony ground is worse, the wayside is the worst; but the good ground, says Jesus, are they which, in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring

forth fruit with patience. Blessed be God, that he can discover, in unconverted and unregenerate men, some good. If there is one thought under high heaven encouraging to man, it is that God Almighty recognizes the fact that there may be good and honest hearts in unregenerate men, who will receive the word of the living God and obey it, yielding to the authority of the everlasting God, that they may have everlasting life. Will any man tell me that no unconverted man has in his breast a good and honest heart? Why, sir, I had as soon adopt Tom Paine's Age of Reason as such an idea. I deny that a man of the world is totally depraved. I have two instances in which the doctrine of total hereditary depravity is subverted—one that speaks concerning the infant, and says, "of such is the kingdom of God," who repudiates the idea of its being totally depraved; and one that speaks of adult persons who receive the word of God into a good and honest heart. Christ repudiates the doctrine; he puts his seal of condemnation upon it for ever and ever; and it has no place in this world nor the world to come. I ask you to look at this classification.

I begin to get into the secret now of my friend having such an affection for the mourners' bench. You can not find in the New Testament where the apostles ever called persons to the

mourners' bench. You can not find such a passage from the beginning to the end of God's Book. There is not one particle of evidence where God justifies it. When the man's heart is stirred by the word of God, and he comes to the minister of Jesus Christ, inquiring the way, in the place of setting up a human institution which God never appointed, he tells him to go to the commandment of the everlasting God for evidence of faith. I want to show you why he has such a tender regard for this institution. The preacher is willing to save the dear people, so he warms up their hearts; they are willing and want to be saved; they come forward to the preacher for salvation; the preacher is perfectly willing, so are the people—but God is not; so they get down on their knees in a corner to plead with him. I declare that he is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. "He that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." "To-day, if you will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." "Now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation." The impression is made that the preacher is willing, the sinners themselves are willing to be saved, but they must get God willing. If this is not the unvarnished state, then my friend did not try to dodge the discussion of the mourners' bench. You see, in the correspondence, how he dodged, twisted, and

tried to get over it. He holds that the people are willing to be saved; the preacher claims that he is willing to save them; but they must pray for Almighty God to do his part. Now, I want it distinctly understood, that from this day forward I repudiate the doctrine that Christ is not willing, when the poor sinner comes to him with a contrite heart, a broken spirit, and a love of Christ in his soul, inquiring the way to everlasting life. God is willing, all heaven is willing, and the doors of the gospel are always open, and all that is wanted is a preacher enlightened enough to quote the answer of the holy apostles of Jesus to these seeking sinners. I will tell you, gentlemen, this is a subject that is to be spread out over the length and breadth of this country. I will tell you I have some confidence in the judgment of the people. The day I am glad is gone when the power and influence of a "Rev." sticking to a man's name is able to gull the masses of the people;—that God has given the people power to think and reason for themselves in regard to these grand matters; and the time has gone by when the people of this generation can be made to believe that the reason they are not regenerated is on account of the disposition on the part of God. God has given man the ability to come. He is always willing and ready to receive him; and if he will not avail himself of

the gracious privileges which God has afforded, it is his own fault. Do you believe that man has no ability to get to God? There was a time when he had not the ability to become a Christian, to which Paul alludes in Rom. v.—“For, when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly.” Why did not Paul preach the doctrine, “We are *now* corrupt.” Blessed be his name, that strength should be given them, and the way should be opened, that they might come to God. Listen to our Lord Jesus Christ, in the 15th chapter of John’s testimony: “If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sins.” My friend would have said: “You have a mantle of total depravity; men are depraved, and can do nothing.” Yes, sir; they have a cloak for their sins. He stands before you in the attitude of the man of sin; he alleges that total depravity is hereditary; that it descends on man, and that, consequently, he has no power to avoid it; he can not recover himself; and the reason man stands in sin is, because God has never given him the ability or the power to turn away from them. Now, I want you to understand distinctly that brother Fisher did not make the doctrine of total depravity. I do not blame Bros. Helm and Robinson. Indeed, I have no unkind feelings for them. It is my benevolent

wish that they should try and open the way, so that men can get to God. From the beginning of the apostolic preaching, at Pentecost, to the final amen of the New Testament, a seeker never came to the kingdom of God who was not shown the way at the first interview with the preacher. It was not the case then as it is in modern times, when they keep men seeking and groping in the dark for ten years, and then declare that they have not certainly found the way. It is not the clear, glorious, and luminous system of the gospel of the blessed God. Is it not more desirable to have the clear, glorious and brilliant light of the sunshine of righteousness, than to be laboring under the confusion and darkness of these benighted systems of the nineteenth century? My brethren are right in the Bible Union—they are right in their missionary work; but when the people come inquiring the way, I want it shown to them on the first interview, and introduce them the same day into the kingdom of God, and not wait for the next monthly meeting. That “next monthly meeting” is a “modern landmark.”

But I want to take one more look at this question of total hereditary depravity. If men are wholly depraved, it is not in their power to do any thing for themselves; they must maintain a spirit of “masterly inactivity”—fold their hands in calm resignation, and await their

inevitable fate. Brother Fisher says the first thing to be done is to think that we have no power in ourselves, while brother Jeter, who talks about Campbelism (I never got nearer than three miles of it in his review of that strange, indescribable heresy), says that sinners must have an affection superior to, and above, the Lord. Well, now, here is an ability for the poor sinner. "Why do you not go to God?" says brother Fisher. "I have nothing but the testimony of the apostles, who preached nothing but the word," says the sinner. "I am waiting for ability, as I have none myself; can't I get you to intercede with God for me, brother Fisher, and get him to give me that affection superior to the Lord? The reason that I am a sinner is no fault of mine, but God will not send down that *something* which he alone can bestow." What a consolatory doctrine is this? I would stand up in the last day of the judgment and plead the sinner's cause, if he never had the power to go to God. But God says you have no cloak for your sins. My friend quoted a passage yesterday—"But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God; even to them that believe on his name." John i. 12. [*Time expired.*]

SATURDAY, JUNE 6, 2 o'clock, P. M.

[MR. FISHER'S SECOND ADDRESS.]

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I arise to answer, in part, the last speech of my opponent. He seems to think that, because I spoke of him as a learned man, it was invidious. If I had called him an ignoramus, why, every body would have said that it was invidious, and the Moderator would have called me to order; but as the epithet "learned," applied to him, as heretofore, seems to be offensive, I will forbear in the future, and call him my *opponent*.

On yesterday I made a statement I wish to take back. I said that my opponent was out of soap; but, from the quantity of suds he has poured forth in his speech to-day, I see that he is not out of the article, but it is soap of a bad quality. [Merriment.] My opponent dealt in downright assertions—threadbare, unqualified assertions. Assertions without proof are not facts, as every intelligent person knows. It is one thing to ridicule a position or an argument, and it is quite a different thing to meet a position and answer an argument. My opponent, in his speech, was at all points of the compass; sometimes he was ridiculing this precious Book as a Baptist Bible—as my prayer book, which

was irrelevant, and for which the Moderators should have called him to order; and, then, he was down on the altar of prayer in the most blasphemous terms. If I were to make the same threadbare, reckless assertions, about the altar of prayer, or throne of grace, that my opponent has made, I believe that God would kill me in this pulpit! I would be afraid to bend my knees in prayer before God, lest the thunder, that now idly slumbers in his hand, would be aroused against me in indignation, and take up the Maker's quarrel, who has commanded us to come humbly to a throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in every time of need. And my opponent could not let go the horns of the altar without making a false charge against me. I was sorry, from the bottom of my heart, to hear from the lips of one that did know better, such a charge as he made against me. I am too much of a gentleman to say that the charge was a lie! I will simply say that it was not true. He charged me with having backed out from defending my practice at the altar of prayer, or the mourners' bench. Here is the correspondence and the propositions. This single pamphlet he edits and publishes; and he published the correspondence, and knew, when he made the charge, that it was not true. It is here, in language that he can not misunderstand: "Baptists

affirm that it is right to pray for sinners at the altar of prayer, (not the mourners' bench); Disciples deny." Is not that my proposition, in the affirmative? Have ever I dodged from it? Have ever I said I would not debate it? No, sir! The trouble with my opponent is this: He sought in the correspondence to take every advantage of me in fixing up the propositions, and he would not debate a single proposition presented in the catalogue, only those in his own language. When I presented the same propositions which we are debating, in language as clear, as significant, as expressive as the English language could afford, why, he would not debate them until they were presented in his own language; and then, when I presented six propositions, three in his own language, and three in mine, the three in his own he agreed to. But hear what he says upon that agreement: "Yours of the 7th is at hand, and three propositions are agreed to. This is right, for these three fairly embrace the 'distinctive differences' between the Disciples and Baptists." Well, now, sir, all of these three, as he says, fairly embrace the distinctive differences between the Disciples and Baptists. Are we not debating these distinctive differences? And why does he stand up in the face of what he has said, and in the face of my proposition, and bring a false charge against me, which, unless he takes back.

I shall be compelled to lose my good opinion of him. I would be sorry to do that, for, when I came into the assembly, I thought he looked a little torvous, and, as I had a few lumps of sugar to clear my own throat, I divided with him, thinking I might sweeten him up a little, and make him pleasant; but the sugar soured upon his stomach, and he brought forth these foul charges.

But to the point at issue: My opponent repudiates the doctrine of total hereditary depravity; he has an abhorrence of the doctrine; he despises it from the very bottom of his heart, and regards it as an hysterical old woman looks at ghosts by moonlight. I stated most clearly and definitely, in the most explicit terms of our current literature, what I meant, and if my church does not subscribe to it, then I will say that I am wrong. By the doctrine of total hereditary depravity, we do not mean these hobgoblins—these men of straw, of hay, of wood, or of stubble, that his fruitful imagination created, and, Quixot-like, mistook for a giant. I could but think of the mountain being in labor, and the ridiculously small offspring which was the result of such travail. My opponent misrepresented me most egregiously when he said I brought forward Isaiah v. 6, as one of my proof-texts, to prove the term total depravity. I quoted but one single text in proof

of hereditary depravity, and then gave what I thought was the very best authority. I gave what Mr. Campbell said in his *Christian Baptist*; but my opponent not only repudiates, in round terms, what the Bible says, but he repudiates the father of the current Reformation, by saying that he is not good authority with him upon this subject. Whenever Mr. Campbell agrees with him, Mr. Campbell is good authority; but, whenever he disagrees, Mr. Campbell is no authority at all! But, perhaps he may very learnedly tell me that I do not understand Mr. Campbell, as that is the apology which has been made for all the contradictions and unmeaning jargon of Mr. Campbell for the last thirty years. We are so intellectually obtuse as not to understand him! If my opponent introduced any argument at all, to set aside the definitions which were given of total and hereditary depravity, I confess that I did not hear them. My contentent quoted—I won't say he plagiarized, for literary theft, in the estimation of literary men, is about as bad as sheep stealing would be in the estimation of all honest men—I will not charge him with having plagiarized from Mr. Raine's little book, styled "A Refutation of the Doctrine of Total Hereditary Depravity." I want no better evidence than this book affords—that men are totally depraved. Mr. Raine has not fairly stated the doctrine,

much less refuted it. I can show that in Genesis v. 6, he has perverted—that he has added to, not taken from, the word of God, in order to build up a false system in opposition to the great fundamental doctrine of hereditary depravity; and I was sorry when I saw in this book, the text-book of my opponent, and the text-book of most every Disciple throughout the length and breadth of the land—I was sorry to see the clear perversion. I thought it was a mistake when first I saw it; but, when the man went on arguing, page after page, arguments based upon that perversion, I then knew it must be a willful perversion, upon his part, in order to oppose a great truth. Now, my opponent has been fighting the doctrine of total hereditary depravity; but, has he told you whether infants were depraved or not? He has not stated to what extent they are depraved—whether they are totally or partially so. Why did he not, in his attempted refutation of the doctrine that I am advocating, show to what extent they were depraved, if they were not totally depraved? If they are not totally depraved, how does he know it, and how dare he assert it, in the face of a mountain of truth, whose summit is bathed in the beatific visions of heaven? How dare he contradict inspired penmen, men of God? I would just remark here, that if he did not quote from Mr. Raine's

work on total depravity, a great similarity exists between their thoughts and language, which verifies the axiom that "great minds sometimes run in the same channel." I have no doubt my opponent will have our Savior totally depraved, because he was born of the Virgin Mary. Well, if he does, as a matter of course, he must give his statement in the language of Mr. Raine.

Now, my beloved hearers, I want to know, if, in every speech that has been made upon these distinctive differences between the Disciples and the Baptists, he has treated one single proposition syllogistically? I do not say that my opponent is not a logician — "in logic, a great critic, profoundly skilled in analytic." I would not say that he does not stand upon an equal footing with me so far as the correspondence reads; but I confess that if I stand with him, it is only upon the platform by which we are both governed in this debate; for I confess that if I were the father of such a speech — such an offspring — such a nondescript as he brought forth and presented in his former effort, it should deny its paternity — I would disown it. I would not have made such a speech, and have it published broadcast over the valley of the Mississippi, for five hundred dollars. And I tell you, my hearers, by all our moral chemistry and philosophy, by all our natural and acquired mental acumen, my friend may put his speech

into the crucible, he may analyze it, and he will find nothing but the refiner's dross. Now, I do not intend to follow the *lex talionis*, and answer my opponent by making flat, round, contradictory assertions. I possess the magnanimity above such trifling meanness as that. I stand upon the platform of heaven's eternal truth, and here I will stand, though the earth may reel and the heavens rock and thunder over my head; firmly fixed upon the rock of ages, the huge waves and mountain billows may dash, but they will only expire in foam, and leave me standing to meet the sunlight of heaven, as it travels down from the burning suns of eternity.

Now, my beloved hearers, let me present some proof-texts, which, for my own convenience, I have already arranged. Did the man suppose that I was going to meet the great and mighty Benjamin Franklin without any preparation? He has relied upon his native strength and endurance merely, instead of relying upon the preparation that he should have made, and then committed his case to God. But every man can see that he has made no preparation; that these incoherent assertions that he has been throwing out, are the same he has been making ever since he professed to live among the Disciples, promulgating them from pulpit to pulpit, from congregation to congregation, from one

end of the country to the other, and relying upon them as being equal to Bible truths. He has supposed that he could palm all such religious fraud upon the intelligence of this community. But sir, there is too much intelligence here, too much piety, too much learning and morality, to swallow down such drugs as my opponent brought forth from the apothecary shop of his imagination. He has come forward with no panacea from the materia medica of nature; he has no catholicon but baptism for the remission of sins: no argument against the doctrine of total hereditary depravity, but round assertions, but "little totally depraved infants." [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FRANKLIN'S SECOND REPLY.]

It is our good fortune to have the privilege to make a feeble effort to try to survive. It is true the speech that you have listened to is a little terrifying, as some strong assertions and most oft-repeated systematical misrepresentations that I ever listened to, have come from the worthy gentleman. But there is one very material matter in debate, which he forgets all the time, and that is *argument*. In all his preparation, with all his testimony — full of notes —

he comes up here, delivers half an hour's speech, and forgets the proof! Now, the most essential thing in a debate is *proof*: this he leaves out.

But he declares now that I have falsely charged him with refusing to discuss this "mourners' bench" question. What kind of a proposition does he read about? He proposes to meet in solemn discussion in the town of Ghent, and defend the altar of prayer. And where is the altar of prayer? In our families, when we pray; and it is right to pray for sinners there; and who ever doubted this right? The question is, whether this practice in the ceremony of converting men to Christianity, as practiced by the Baptists, calling up sinners to pray and be prayed for, is right. Did he ever agree to debate that proposition in his life? He declared to the people what he has done in calling sinners to God; but he is not there when I demand him to meet me in discussion. He backs out. Do the Scriptures first call sinners forward to be prayed for, and have others pray that the Lord may convert them and pardon their sins, as practiced by the Baptists before baptism? I offered that proposition to him, begged him to come up and defend it, but, no, sir! Rev. T. J. Fisher does not defend what he practices. Well, there is another thing here in the same connection: "Any person in the

kingdom of God has the same right to commune any time, and in any place where the children of God are at the Lord's table." I offered that to him after he declared and published in Bro. Robinson's *Recorder* that some members of the Baptist church had committed "abominable heresy." I offered to meet him, and debate that. He backs out. "I am not prepared to defend that; I may call my Baptist brothers heretics, if they commune with Disciples, but I will not defend it, though." Now, have I charged him falsely? But I beg his indulgence a moment, while I refer, incidentally, to another matter. He says plagiarism is about as bad as sheep-stealing. I never saw a man as desirous as my friend is to compare an opponent to mean things. I had rather compare him to something noble and elegant. I have not attempted to compare him to a Mormon, or any thing mean, since the debate commenced. This is so little. It is so diminutive for a man in one breath to be soaring among the stars, so far that we could not see him, and then, the next moment he is away down here, dealing with little matters, so small that a man can not see them without the aid of a microscope attached to the end of a telescope. Where does he find any plagiarism? Why, forsooth, I made a remark in my discourse, which is almost identical with the remark found in the range of Bro.

Raine's depravity! I read it about twenty years ago, but I have never seen it since. It happens that I have expressed in words almost precisely the same as those used in his work, but I do not know what they are. One thing is very certain: I have done nothing that can be called plagiarism during this controversy. The quotation I made was from Watts, and not from Raine. The gentleman informed me, in the correspondence that he was "a Kentuckian, a gentleman," and he hoped, "a Christian." Now this last point, though the most important, seems to prove a little doubtful; but, in regard to the others, they are unequivocal, which fact I think he has demonstrated pretty clearly. I do not intend to enter into any controversy on that point. I am willing to leave it to the people, how much gentlemanship, Kentuckian-ship, and Christian feeling he has. It does not become me to announce it from this pulpit. The community will judge all questions of this kind.

Another serious matter that he discovers in my speech, this morning, is that I have almost gone into blasphemy. I declare I should shudder at the bare idea of blasphemy. I had not the most remote thought of such a thing, and I question if any person in this audience apprehended any danger of having their ears polluted with blasphemy. He thought I was

trying to ridicule the altar of prayer. Never did I think of burlesquing such a thing. But I have no faith in this institution which he has erected in the church, for converting sinners, and for which no authority can be found in the Bible. I do not hold that I am under any strong obligations to say any thing like that without proof. If my friend would discuss the question of sprinkling, he would not consider it any blasphemy to expose it; he would show that it is an ordinance of man—having no divine sanction. In precisely the same way, I say in reference to every man's institution. When a sinner, through faith in our Redeemer; comes forward to join the people of God, instead of the minister, in answer to his inquiries, telling him to "come up, and we will pray for you, and try and get the Lord to relent," requiring something of him which God never required, he should point the only way directed by the Bible. His conduct has no precedent in the word of God; and among all the preachers who are in attendance, not one of them can find a passage therein corroborative of the theory. But my friend has practiced pretty largely in some sections of the country without this mourners' bench—without praying for the "seekers." And again, where others came forward, and inquired what they should do, he, without any hesitation, would receive them into

the *mourners' bench*. Let all this, however, go for the present.

I called your attention this morning to a number of passages, showing clearly and explicitly that this doctrine could not be true, insomuch as God had recognized, on the part of some unconverted men, the fact that they have some good in them. I am now going to introduce a new case, as proof of my position. Turn over to Acts x., where you will find Cornelius, who prayed to God always; he gave alms to the people; he was an upright man, a philanthropist, and in fact, the personification of morality itself. God sent an angel unto him, who told him that his alms and prayers had come up in remembrance before God, and that he must send men to a certain man who lived in Joppa, named Simon, who, coming to him, would tell him of things whereby he and his household would be saved. Here, then, we have a man in an unregenerate state. After the conversion of the Gentiles, the apostle Peter returned to his Jewish brethren, to pacify them by presenting this matter in its true light before them. After relating the manner in which he had been directed to go to Cornelius, he says: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning;" and says he, "What was I, that I could withstand God?" and he goes on to declare the truth

to them. Then they say: "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life?" Here we have the expression that repentance was granted to Cornelius, and that he was saved. Here is a man, who, up to the time that Peter came to him, had not heard words whereby he should be saved. Now, these men submit to the gospel, are converted, and received into the kingdom of Jesus Christ. He commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord; and when they entered into the name of the Lord, the pardon was the same as that of the Jews and Gentiles, who had obtained salvation in the same way. God made no difference between them and the Jews at the beginning. Well, we here find this man converted; but how was it before he was converted? Why, God declares he was a devout man; that he prayed to God always; that he gave much alms to the people; he was in good report throughout all the nations of the Jews. Dare my friend tell this audience that Cornelius was totally depraved? Is not the foregoing account clear and unequivocal evidence that that man had God in him? Why, he had a good and honest heart; and when the apostle came to tell him words whereby he was to be saved, he believed; and when God granted him repentance, and when the name of Jesus Christ was set before him, he received salvation or pardon

through his name, as did the Jews at the beginning. My friend has a great liking for soap, so I will get a little passage in the Bible, where we read about this soap: Malachi iii. — “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner’s fire, and like fullers’ soap.” Well, what is he coming to refine? A mass of total hereditary depravity? Now, suppose you had a mass of dross, and should attempt to refine it, what would be the result? Why, when you have refined the dross away, there is *nothing*—just what is left of my friend’s doctrine. If a man is totally corrupt, I should like to know what is to be regenerated by *his* hypothesis? I should like to know what it is that is to be born again? Why, a mass of total corruption is to be born again! What a glorious doctrine, that. It represents the blessed Savior, the Infinite One, as moving this mass of corruption. I want to take one more glance at Isaiah, whom, he says, he did not quote to prove *hereditary* depravity, but *total*. Why did he not say it related to Israel alone, instead of applying it to all mankind?

Some things are done a little slyly sometimes. Why did he quote that passage, and apply it to the Gentiles, if he did not think it contained any proof of his theory? It is because he had not looked at the conclusions. He either did not know what preceded that verse, or else he knew it, and intended to select scraps of the word, and not let this audience know their context. If he did not know what God was talking about, then, I claim, he is not a competent expounder of the Scriptures—that he is not sufficiently reliable to be a preacher of the gospel. Now, he can explain it which ever way he pleases, but I had rather he would say that he is mistaken, and then, I will forgive him immediately. Did you notice in what a derisive manner he quoted from Rom. iii.? Judging from the repulsive form, it must have rested rather disagreeably on his stomach. He undertook to show where Bro. Raine had done injustice to his doctrine. Bro. Raine is a hundred miles off, and he can speak of him with little respect, as he is invisible; but Bro. Raine is abundantly able to stand before this audience, and needs no assistance from me. And this also is why I do not undertake to explain what Mr. Campbell has said. I care nothing about these assertions that Mr. Campbell has made; he does not need me to stand and go into any controversy about his language. We have a

clear and explicit proposition under discussion, and the Bible contains within itself sufficient evidence, pro or con, to substantiate a doctrine without aid from other source.

“Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.” This reminds me of what a man said of his child, who was running on the floor to-day. “Mr. Fisher may preach till doomsday, but he can never persuade me that my child is corrupt, because Christ says, ‘of such is the kingdom of heaven.’ A man may talk about their being sinful, wicked, and depraved, and about the necessity of their being regenerated, from this to the last day of eternity: the little infant stands free from all charges such a doctrine as this would heap upon it.” He paid no respect to what I said concerning adult persons. He has a peculiar faculty of forgetting that which he knows he can not reply to. What reason did Jesus give for admonishing adult persons? He said: “Except you repent and become as little children;” and what does my friend say of a little child? “totally corrupt—you can not see the kingdom of God.” My friend is going through the land like an apostle, trying to convert men, that they may become as little children—“totally corrupt,”—and baptize them to a state of infancy, that is, a state of “total corruption!” [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FISHER'S THIRD ADDRESS.]

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The readers of this debate will see that I never compared my opponent to a Mormon; I never compared him to a sheep thief. I deny these charges. My opponent fitted up a proposition upon communion, in his own style, in accordance with his own taste, and then, because I would not meet him upon a proposition, constructed so as to satisfy himself and protect his system, he comes up and states to this enlightened assembly that I backed out from the communion question! In my eight propositions did I not offer to debate this question? Do the Disciples affirm that the Scriptures teach open communion? My opponent is an ingenious, an artful man; he is skilled in such kind of literary intriguing. He said in Louisville, in private conversation, that he knew the whole controversy would turn here upon the individuals who were in the kingdom, and those who were not, and not the subject of close or open communion at all. Now, sirs, will my opponent, after we have discussed the three propositions, which, he says, fairly embrace the distinctive differences between the Baptists and the Reformers, affirm unrestricted communion to be scriptural and right? If he will, I will

deny it, and show that it is an abominable heresy. Now, sirs, if you will say, after we have discussed these propositions, that the Scriptures nowhere teach that it is right to pray for sinners before baptism, I will deny it, and will undertake to prove, before this assembly, that it is right. He brings a false charge against me, when he essays to show that I receive individuals into the Baptist church as he does into the society of Disciples. It is not true. I never was guilty of such a thing as that in my life. Everybody knows that when an individual comes forward to join the Baptist church, he gives a reason of the hope that is in him before baptism; but my opponent and the Disciples require no experience before baptism—only a mere confession that Jesus is the Christ—such as Simon Magus made, and such as the Devil would make. It is a false charge against me.

When I was endeavoring to prove, from Isaiah i. 5, 6, that there was a word within the lids of the Bible that was synonymous with the term in my proposition, he gets up here and ridicules me for not having told you that this related to the Israelites, and says, if I will get up and confess it, that he will forgive me! *You* my father confessor? I never bowed my knee to man. I bow to God, and to God alone. Confess to a mere man, whose breath is in his

nostrils? Confess to a poor, fallible, erring man? What! I confess to him against whom I have not sinned? If I have done him wrong, convict me of the fact, and I will make the *amende honorable* before this assembly; and if he will do by me as he desires me to do by him, in this discussion, he will cease to ridicule the rich throne of grace, around which, I presume, his family cluster. I do not know whether he does it privately or not—these matters relate to himself alone. Now, my beloved hearers, let me ask you who was the progenitor of the Israelites by nature? Was not Adam the father of the whole human family, and did not God make of one flesh and of one blood all the nations of the earth that dwell upon his footstool? Now, my beloved hearers, I wonder, if this is true of the Jews, as a nation, if it is not true of them as individuals? for individuals make up nations. If it is true as a whole, is it not true as a part? for the parts go to make up the whole. If I say that this whole congregation is sick, is it not true that every individual that composes this congregation is also ill? for, what is true of persons individually, is likewise true of them collectively. If it is true of the Israelites as a nation, it is also true of them as individuals. Well, now, pray, if this Gentile, of whom my friend was so learnedly speaking, this devout man (and here he had to get back

upon the design of baptism; he had enough of that, I thought, to answer him the balance of his life), was not unregenerated? Let us see what Paul says on this subject: Rom. iii. 9—“Book of Scraps”—“What, then? are we better than they? No, in no wise, for we have before proved, both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin.” That is what we mean by total depravity. And does not my proposition clearly state that they are sinful by nature? My opponent gets up, in the face of my definition, which an honorable contentent ought not to do, and would foist upon this congregation a definition of his own coining, and, forsooth, would have me father it. But I father no such filthy spawn of his own brain. “As it is written, there is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God: they are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one: their throat is an open sepulchre: with their tongues they have used deceit: the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace they have not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes. Now we know, that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who

are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." What do you think of that, my beloved hearers, in opposition to the speech of my opponent? I wish here to make one remark upon the passage which he has quoted, viz: "Of such is the kingdom of heaven"—in reference to infants. Does the kingdom of heaven there allude to the kingdom that is to come, or to the kingdom of Christ here upon earth; which, if it relates to the latter, what becomes of my opponent's theory, that the kingdom was not set up until the day of Pentecost? How can you harmonize these things? Do not I say that every infant, dying in infancy, goes to heaven? Does he wish to have them saved upon their natural purity and innocence? If this is his plan of infant salvation, of course, they are not saved by the blood and atoning merits of Jesus Christ. If it alludes to the kingdom of Christ, here upon earth, and he admits that they are partially depraved, then the passage reads, "Suffer little children to come unto me, for of such little partially depraved beings is the kingdom of heaven!" Now, what does he prove by it? Nothing whatever. *I* proved that they are totally depraved, and *he* tries to prove that they are only partially depraved. What I mean by total depravity is, that they have no spiritual light in them; that

it is moral; that they lost the image of God. When Adam stood, his whole posterity stood in him; when he fell, his whole posterity fell in him; when he lost the image of God, which consisted in righteousness and holiness, his posterity, which was then in him, also lost the image. Adam is the fountain, his descendants are the stream; if the fountain is bitter, how can the stream be pure? Adam is the tree, we the fruit; the tree being corrupt, how can the fruit be good? Is not this, sir, an axiom in the laws of nature, and is it not also one laid down by the Son of God, in this book of ethics, which all the infidelity, whether baptized or sprinkled, or in whatever shape it comes, can never overturn?

Now, let us see what David says in the 51st psalm: "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." That which is true of David is true of my opponent, is true of myself, and is true of every infant that is born into the world. Now, turn, if you please, to Ephesians ii. 3: "Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." Not by practice, not by example, not by education, but by *nature*, says the Holy Spirit; and the man who says it is not by nature, gives the lie to

the Holy Spirit. Upon this most important and vital subject, Job says (vide xiv. 4), "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one." Again, xv. 14, "What is man, that he should be clean? and he which is born of woman, that he should be righteous?" Man is here used as a generic term, relating to the whole human family. In Isaiah, xlvi. 8, he says, "Man is a transgressor from the womb," using highly figurative language, to show that the very first acts that he performs, when he arrives to years of accountability, are those of transgression. "The wicked are estranged from the womb." Is it not a mournful truth that as soon as a child begins to talk, it begins to equivocate? Does it not prove the mournful fact that man is depraved by nature? Mr. Campbell is good authority with me, for he speaks the truth when he says, in his *Christian Baptist*, No. 8, vol. vi.: "I repeat it, all persons are born children of wrath, else they can never become vessels of wrath." How do they become vessels of wrath? My opponent knows that the doctrine of total depravity, as defined by me, in this discussion, is believed by all orthodox Christians in Christendom, and that upon this is based the atonement of Jesus Christ. He knows that it was upon the fall of man that God promised a deliverer—that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's

head. My opponent thinks because an infant is totally depraved, he is incapable of adding sin to sin. Have I not stated, in my definition, that by depravity we do not mean that a man is incapable of adding crime to crime. Here is a man arraigned for the crime of murder; his guilt is proven upon him by witnesses of undoubted veracity; the judge passes the sentence of condemnation, and appoints the day of his execution. Now, are we to understand, if that man can escape the fangs of law, that he is incapable of murdering another man? Is he a murderer, partially? Has he not been proven to be a murderer, wholly? If he is only a partial murderer, why not lessen the penalty? why require an entire death for a partial murder? Why not merely immure him in a prison? He can not only kill another man, but could kill hundreds and thousand, if he were placed under those circumstances and temptations which induced him to kill the first man. Now, does not this fact illustrate most beautifully our position? My friend admits that his satanic majesty is totally depraved, but he has not heard of his sinning. Merciful God! Was it no sin for the Devil to tempt Jesus Christ? no sin to offer him the kingdoms of this world? no sin to tempt him to fall down and worship him? Although the Devil is totally depraved, as my opponent admits, he is under the very same

obligations to love and worship God that you and I are. Has his moral responsibility been disturbed? No, sir! His total depravity does not exempt him from the command to worship. When he offered Jesus the splendid empires and kingdoms of this world, if he would fall down and worship him, Christ said, "Get thee behind me, Satan, for it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Here is a totally depraved being—the very Devil himself—the very being whom you instance as a proof in favor of your position against total depravity, who is commanded to worship and serve the living God. My mind travels with telegraphic speed. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FRANKLIN'S THIRD REPLY.]

It travels with telegraphic speed—especially when he gets off the track, as he did for the last five minutes, to fight a man of straw, of his own manufacture, and to imply that I said the Devil did not sin. I said he did not grow any worse, because he is totally depraved; and if all mankind were like him, they could not get any worse. He has a happy way of twisting every thing into a new issue. The sin the Devil commits is adding one to more,

but it does not make him any worse; for, if one is totally corrupt, how can he grow any worse?

I beg your indulgence while I make one more reference to the correspondence. I want to refer to a proposition which I made to the gentleman to debate this question of communion. In my letter to him, I say, "I am truly sorry to find your courage failing you, when called upon to defend your practice. In your notice of your meeting in Ghent, in the *Western Recorder* of the 18th, you assert that 'that abominable heresy of open communion had been practiced by some of its (the Baptist church's) most worthy members.' Here, sir, is a proposition in your own unequivocal words. You affirm that some of the most worthy members in the Baptist church, in Ghent, are guilty of abominable heresy, in occasionally communing with the Disciples. I deny it. You shall defend your position, maintained in that community, on this point, or let it appear to the people that you are conscious that you can not. Your charge of heresy against some of the most worthy members in the Baptist church, in Ghent, is not true. I deny this charge; and you shall defend it, or show that you had no confidence in it when you made it. Will you defend your pompous charge, as it stands, in your own printed words, in the *Recorder*? This you shall now do, or show that you were

not sincere when you made it." If this is not opening the way for him to get up a discussion on this subject—

Mr. Fisher. Is that any part of the correspondence?

Mr. Franklin. Yes, sir! He pronounces some of the best members of the Baptist church of this place guilty of abominable heresy. I propose to defend them, and he backs out from the whole matter, and refuses to come up and prove his charge. Now, if he would take it all back, I would not mind it; but he makes a new proposition. He will debate with me the question of unrestricted communion! Well, unrestricted communion would take in every man. He told you, eloquently and piously, that it would take in infidels. I never intimated my belief in unrestricted communion. I hold this, sir, that every child of God has a right to the Lord's table whenever he is present, or may be present, and there is not a man in this house who can gainsay it. I offered to argue with him the question whether the children of God may not have the right to commune together. He starts up and makes a proposition about restricted and open communion. I want to know whether the children of God have not a right to sit down at the Lord's table? I want to know whether any man, be he Baptist, or what not, can bar away a Christian from the

Lord's table? whether his table is not free for every child of God? He backs out. Here is where the issue stands between him and myself. I object to his altar of prayer as a converting machine. I contend that it is not found in the oracles of God, and, up to this period, he has not been able to produce any thing of the kind, and he never can. I will produce Scripture for infant baptism, for worshiping idols, for transubstantiation, for the most preposterous practices of the Roman church, the moment he produces one article in substantiation of his theory. He never will, nor never can, show one single word in the Bible for it.

There is another thing to which I wish to allude, as he challenges me that I have abused—

Rev. Mr. Johnson, rising. He must say nothing about me; he has slandered me in the public prints.

Mr. Franklin. All I want to say is, that I have not slandered that good brother; and, if I have, my paper is open, like the doors of the gospel of grace, to receive any corrections or reply which he may see fit to make.

I want to call your attention to my friend's last speech. He says Simon made the confession we have sinners to make. I am much obliged to him for that. Do you know what preacher he was under when he made that confession?

It was not a Campbellite preacher, but it was old Phillip, one of the seven, full of the Holy Ghost and of power. He went down to Samaria, and there preached the word; and my friend says Simon made the same confession that we have the sinner to make. He requires now other than gospel evidence of the hope that is within them. I wonder where he gets the Scripture for that? Neither he or any other man in this town, ever produced one word of such Scripture, and they never can. They may call up those who come forward and wish to become members of the Church, and demand of them an evidence of the hope that is within them, and to tell what they call an experience; but when it comes to pointing out Bible authority, they have not the power—there is no such thing there, sir. So you see very little difference between us and Phillip, who took the same confession that we do. Simon made the same confession we require people to make now. But last night he gave us a little hint of Simon's acts. He told us that Simon never was converted, that he was in the bonds of iniquity—and what else? Why, "in the gall of bitterness." That little word is an interpolation. But Peter says: "Repent and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee." The wicked thought that the gift of God could be purchased with money. I take it that

Simon was a "Spirit-rapper," and seeing the apostles imbue others with the Holy Ghost, he thought, by obtaining such knowledge, he could turn it to good account in secrecy. The apostle turns around and challenges him that he was in the bonds of iniquity. And this man had been baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. Peter admonishes him to pray that the sin of his heart might be forgiven him. There is not an intimation in the passage that his conversion was not all right; and it was not until after he had entered the covenant that he apostatized, fell from grace. When I proposed that the gentleman should confess that it was through ignorance, he did not inform you that it was only the Israelites of whom the prophet spoke, he says he never did confess to man. Well, I declare! God says, "confess your faults, one to another;" and again, "forgive one another." But he has nothing to do with this part of the testimony. He confesses no fault. What! a man of his gigantic dimensions, who towers to the heavens, soars among the stars, and preaches about an immense column that he has reared to the heavens, to come down and ask him to confess to a poor fellow-mortal? It would be an implication that he was mortal, and could possibly sin! He never does any thing of that kind. Never, never, in his infallibility, does he confess to mortal man! It is too

condescending. I never get up into such lofty ideas. I will confess to you, sir, and would like to have you forgive me, if you please.

The gentleman quotes an expression of Paul's to show that we are all under sin. The question between him and myself is not, whether we are all under sin or not, but it is, whether we are under total hereditary depravity. But this same passage says we have all gone out of the way. Well, then, they had been in the way, and had fallen from grace. Brother Fisher, they were in the way once, and God, in making his charge against them says, they had gone out of the way, which is like another passage: "They go speaking lies from their mothers' womb," but the lies they speak are their own transgressions. The word estranged, in this connection, implies that they had once been acquainted, had once been in the family, but were gone from God. Relying on the personal actions of individuals to prove total hereditary depravity, he has determined to have it that infants are under sin and actual condemnation. I can not see why he does not preach infant regeneration. How does he escape from the language, "of such is the kingdom of heaven"? He tried to answer it with his beautiful argument, splendid "exegesis," and his profound and luminous exposition of the Scriptures. I am willing to answer his question. The kingdom

that was set up on the day of Pentecost, Jesus Christ spoke about when he said, "of such is the kingdom of God." They have the purity, the innocence, and are the best representation of what those should be composing that kingdom; and except you repent and become as little children, you cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Again, I maintain, with Jesus Christ, that little children are not sinful. He never said they were under condemnation, and under guilt. He could not say, you must be converted and become corrupt as they are or you can not enter into the kingdom of God. I believe as much as my friend, that all are under sin; but you must recollect when God says all have sinned, he is not talking about the Adamic sin. He says all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, but he has included them all in unbelief; and can infants be placed in the same category? When he says, all have sinned, he refers to their personal transgressions, and those of which men are to repent or they can not be saved. My friend says, that if what is said of David is true, it is also true of every human being. I want my friend to get ready for the consequences again. Let us hear David tell a little about himself. Psalm li.—"Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving kindness; according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions.

Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin." Are little infants under iniquity? have they ever been guilty? Is it possible, that preachers in the Baptist church talk about the iniquity of infants? Is it not a personal act? does it not incur personal guilt? When David says, "cleanse me from my sins, I acknowledge my transgressions," does it apply to infants? Is it hereditary? David says, "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight." Could a man make a more explicit declaration of his own transgression than David made in this case?

Now, I must complain of the gentleman's family Testament. When he quotes his scrap Testament, do you notice he left out all I have been commenting upon? In quoting that passage about Isaiah being conceived in sin, he simply takes the condition of his mother at the time of conception. Does it imply any thing? Does Isaiah set forth any thing in regard to hereditary sin? He confesses that his mother was sinful, but he says nothing in regard to hereditary sin. My friend now calls on me to say something clearer in regard to infants. I am prepared to enlarge on this point, as I have not had an opportunity heretofore. He wants to know why infants suffer, and pictured some deplorable scenes about the lamentations of mothers over their children. The old doctors of divinity

have something they call actual sin, and original sin. Well, the Adamic sin is one thing, and the personal transgression is another thing. I undertake to say that not one infant has any personal sin. I will just suggest to the gentleman that, in the day when God shall judge the world, according to the Gospel, men will be judged for their personal sin; and no man on that day will be condemned for the Adamic sin. Not one single passage is found in the Bible of God, alleging the Adamic sin as a reason for damning any man in the world. The condemnation lies in man's own personal transgression, and the conversion to Christianity does not deliver any man from the Adamic sin. Every saint is just as much under the influence and power of the Adamic sin as though he had never obeyed the gospel. So, regeneration does not save us from the Adamic sin, from the penalty; it does not deliver us from any thing but our own sin. But the Adamic sin is upon every Christian, just as much upon an infidel as upon an infant, and will be upon us all until we suffer the penalty, and come down to the grave. [*Time expired.*]

SATURDAY, JUNE 6, 8 o'clock, P. M.

[MR. FISHER'S FOURTH ADDRESS.]

Brethren Moderators:

The substance of the proposition proposed to me by Mr. Franklin, is in his editorial upon my letter, and I suppose he had reference to that when I made the remark. What I said in substance is true, and what he said is likewise true—that it was in the correspondence. A great many issues, outside of the proposition in debate, have been made by my opponent, during this discussion, and I must give him credit for having played the cuttle-fish, in trying to blind this audience, behind him, around him, and before him, in relation to the proposition under discussion. I have had five controversies with the Reformers, but I must say that my opponent, though looked upon as the greatest of all with whom I have debated, has evidently produced the most confused and the weakest arguments in support of the principles of the Disciples; and I fear that the cause of that society, in this community, will suffer greatly by the arguments which my opponent has educed. Permit me to say that any fair proposition presented to me, upon the altar of prayer, or, as it is nick-named, as a reproach, “the mourners’ bench,” I am ready to meet,

and will also discuss any fair proposition presented to me on restricted communion, or unrestricted communion, and will either take the negative or affirmative, as the case may be, or as the proposition may be presented to us. I am ready to defend all that I preach, and all that I practice. I am sorry my opponent makes up a system or a doctrine of total hereditary depravity for the Baptists. No such representation of the doctrine, as he has presented it, is believed by any intelligent Baptist, in heaven or upon earth; and we disclaim it. In view of what I have said, in defining our belief, in relation to total hereditary depravity, I say that it is a violation of the rules of this debate, for him to attempt to foist a doctrine upon this community, which I do not believe. I stated, in my definition of total hereditary depravity, that it was total, so far as love to God, and his people, and virtue, were concerned. By nature, man is entirely destitute of these principles, for these are obtained alone by regeneration—by being born again. My definition was in the negative. We do not believe that man was an unvaried mass of corruption and putrefaction. We only believe that he is destitute of holiness and of the immortal image of God. I repeat that he does not possess the love of God, and no infant comes into the world a spiritual child, a joint heir with Jesus Christ in heaven; for that which

is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. They come into the world by being born of the flesh. I was truly sorry to see quibbling upon the part of my worthy opponent, in relation to Psalm li. 5. Now, this psalm contains the painful confession of David, who says he was by nature conceived in sin, and brought forth in iniquity—a complete sentence, a full verse; and in the context and the remainder of the chapter, David goes on to show what he was by grace, and how he had miserably backslidden from the Lord, and he prays to God to be restored; and he was restored. There is the whole truth in relation to this psalm. In the third chapter of the apostle's letter to the Romans, I was sorry to hear my opponent make such a ridiculous, unjustifiable, and unscriptural criticism upon the verse I read in your hearing. In that chapter Paul showed, most conclusively, that in a state of nature there was no difference between the Jew and the Gentile; though the Jews were entrusted with the oracles of God, there was no difference, for they were all, like David, conceived in sin, and brought forth in iniquity. What is true of him is true of every child of Adam that has been conceived since his fall. There is not one single word in all that passage about Jews and Gentiles, having fallen from grace. I can not attribute it to his igno-

rance. He must have known that the Jews were not under the covenant of grace. They could not fall from a covenant in which they were not embraced. If his position is true, the whole world was once in Christ, and the whole world is miserably fallen from grace! The apostle says, "That every mouth be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God." Then the whole world was in a state of "condemnation." I ask my opponent, in the light of his system, if the whole world have not been baptized for the remission of their sins, how could they have gotten into the kingdom of grace? If his system be true, then the whole world had not been baptized into that kingdom, consequently they could not have fallen from, or gone out of, a kingdom in which they were not. Have I not shown, in Rom. v. 12, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin"? Sin is in the world, and how did it get here? Suppose that every person who came into the world died in infancy, the world would soon be depopulated; there would be none to rebel against Almighty God. Have I intimated that an infant is responsible for the sin of Adam? Have I not shown that infants have suffered, because Adam sinned; that they lost the immortal image of God when he fell; that they inherited a corrupt and sinful nature, and a body subject to death, doomed to

the putrefaction of the tomb? And has not death descended from Adam to Moses, from Moses to Jesus Christ, and from Christ until this present time? Where is there an instance in all the universe of an infant having gone to heaven without first dying? My system saves infants upon the righteousness of Jesus Christ, and the atoning merits of my blessed Savior. If they are not thus saved, it devolves upon my opponent to show how they are saved. If they are saved by their infantile purity, they will ascribe salvation to their purity by nature, and their own innocence, and not to the blood of the Lamb. And hence, would not there be a discordant note in heaven by the cherubic millions who bend before the throne of the living God? The infant is brought into this world without its consent, and, if it dies in infancy, God, without its consent, without faith or repentance, purifies its heart by the blood of Jesus Christ, by an act of his own sovereignty; and this is the way infants get to heaven. They must be born again, if Jesus spoke the truth to Nicodemus—“That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” Are not infants born of the flesh, and must they not be born of the Spirit of God? This is done, I repeat, by an act of divine sovereignty—making an application of the blood of Christ to every infant who dies in

a state of infancy. Now, sir, go back beyond the flood, to the fifth chapter of Genesis, and read over the melancholy picture which is drawn of man before the flood, and read the history of man from the flood to the days when Paul painted that graphic picture of both Jews and Gentiles, in the third chapter of Romans: "The whole world was corrupt before God, for all flesh had corrupted *his* way," not "*its* way," as Mr. Raine has it in his book. As certain individuals change the truth of God into a lie, by substituting a lie for the truth, the Koran of Mahomet for the Bible, the Mormon Talmud for the truth of the living God, and baptismal regeneration for the blood of Jesus Christ, which alone was shed for the remission of sins, so the truth of God is changed into a lie, and in this manner, in many instances, God's way is corrupted upon the earth. God's way is always right. Sirs, have I not shown that every imagination, mark that, every imagination, even the thoughts of man, are evil, and only evil. If I throw up a stone a million times in the air, will it not gravitate a million of times to the centre? Does not water run downward? and is man's heart exempt from this law? What does Paul say, in Rom. vii. 18? "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing." And again, in viii. 7, he says, "Because the carnal mind

is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Men come into the world just as Adam was when he fell from a state of moral purity. And, furthermore, let me ask, how are we to account for a fact without a cause? Sin is in the world, and if it did not come into the world through the channel of infancy, in conception, and in being brought forth, how did it get into the world? It is here, and to account for the thing by itself, is preposterous! Every effect must have an adequate cause, and the stream, in the language of Alexander Campbell, can never rise higher than the fountain. Adam being the fountain, we the stream; the fountain being corrupt, the stream must be impure also. Do men come into this world full grown, without being born into it feeble infants, conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity? Is not man a melancholy monument of the fall of Adam? What was the woe pronounced upon woman?—that she should bring forth her offspring into this world with pain, sorrow, and labor. My opponent may try to prove, by his quibbling, shuffling, his specifications of the Scriptures of divine truth, wrenching them to his own destruction, and, I fear, to the destruction of individuals who are following in his wake—he may try to explain all this away, but mothers still live, mournful and melancholy

monuments of the fact. If man is not dead, why did Jesus Christ talk about life? Total hereditary depravity is represented by moral death. Why did he talk about spiritual life? If it is not dead, if it is not sick by nature, why did he talk about a physician? why talk about a panacea? why talk about a balm of Gilead? If he is not spiritually naked, why talk of a robe of righteousness? If he is not lost, why talk about Jesus coming to seek and to save the lost? If my opponent's position is true, in relation to infants, then it seems to me that our blessed Savior might have saved himself a great deal of trouble, sorrow, suffering, persecution, calumny, and the death on the cross, just by creating a great hospital, and having every child that comes into the world born into that hospital, and have angel nurses to rear up a royal priesthood, holy by nature. Now, does not my opponent see the absurdity of the position that he occupies? Suppose he takes the innocent little lamb and cages it with the young lion, when they arrive at maturity, will they have changed their natures, one for the other? Will the lion ever become a lamb, or the lamb a lion, by association, by example, by imitation; and could my opponent, with all his ingenuity, all his philosophy, all his sophistry and learning, educate or mollify the innate ferocity of the young

lion, and make it assume the pacific and inoffensive nature of the young lamb? No, sir; he could not. Suppose that angels were to rear up infants in this great hospital until they arrived at the age of manhood, would they have changed their nature because they had angel nurses? would they have become angels by education, by imitation? No, sir; they would possess the very same sinful, corrupt, and dying nature as though raised by a sinful, erring human. I ask my opponent who Cain imitated when he killed his brother? He was the first murderer! Who tempted him to the commission of fratricide? Whose example did he imitate? Now, sir, you must trace every thing from the last back to the first man. There must be a beginning in wickedness as well as in goodness. Who educated the first man to sin? Whose example did that man imitate? Was he not tempted to sin under the covenant of works under which he was placed after he was created? But now the Redeemer has placed him under a covenant of grace, and surrounded him with an impregnable wall of fire, composed of the oath and promises of the living God; he is there safe, and safe forever!

Why, sirs, look at the doctrine of atonement. If man is only partially depraved, a partial atonement would only be necessary. If individuals are pure by nature, for them no atone-

ment is needed. Jesus Christ never died for them. If infants are holy by nature, why talk of an application of the blood of Christ, as I have done in their behalf? My beloved hearers, this awful system of Socinianism, this abominable heresy, has led thousands and millions down to hell; it is hell's recruiting officer, and you will find among individuals that adopt some easy way of getting to heaven, or of working their way there, the same individuals who universally make a mock of the doctrine of depravity. Good men mourn over it; nations, heathens, philosophers, poets, orators, moralists, have mourned over it. What was the acknowledgment of Plato?—that the world was so wicked in his day, “that no human arm could purify it.” And Cicero—that immortal orator, who threw the thunders of his matchless eloquence upon the ears of the enchanted thousands—did he not say, “that we come into the world with a naked, frail, and infirm body, and a soul prone to divers lusts”? And what did Horace say? the echoes of whose sounding harp still lingers upon classic shores—“No man is born free from vices; he is the best man who is oppressed with the least: that mankind rush into wickedness, and always desire what is forbidden: that youth has the softness of wax to receive vicious impressions, and the hardness of a rock to resist virtuous admonitions; in

short, that we are mad enough to attack heaven itself: that for our repeated crimes does not the God of heaven lay aside his wrathful thunderbolts?" Juvenal says, "Nature, unchangeably fixed, runs back to wickedness, as bodies to their centre." The quotation from Juvenal is a splendid commentary upon what Paul says of himself in Romans vii. 18—though he had never seen Paul's letter: "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good, I find not." Where is the necessity for that kind of change my opponent has been talking about during this debate? Why a divine change of heart, of feelings, of character, or of state? If man is only partially depraved, will not a partial change of heart, of feelings, and state, suffice? Why does he not adopt partial baptism? Why all this talk about an entire regeneration of the soul? Why talk of one faith, one repentance? Why not a partial faith, a partial regeneration, a partial repentance? A kind of moonlight reformation, and baptism for the remission of sins, would be doubtless all my opponent would find necessary. But God saw that nothing but an entire atonement, made by his Son, the darling of his bosom, leaving the throne of eternity, the glory of his Father, resigning the sceptre of the universe for a little season, laying aside

the crown and habiliments of his glory, conceived by the Virgin Mary, not in sin, but pure, immaculate, born under the law, subjected to the law, circumcised, accused of being an imposter, put to death upon the cross, arose from the dead on the third day, ascended forty days afterwards in his triumphal chariot of twenty thousand angels to the throne of the universe, from which he poured out the Holy Spirit, and converted three thousand, in accordance with the preaching of the gospel, on the day of Pentecost. Why did he talk to Nicodemus about an entire new birth? Why did he say to certain individuals, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish?" Why all this, if man is not depraved, if he is not corrupt, if he has not received an oblique direction by nature? He comes into the world poor, feeble, naked, sinful and helpless. Of all the animals that come into the world, man is the most helpless and most dependent; but my opponent, at the expense of the atonement, at the expense of the doctrine of grace, at the expense of the new birth, holds man up as a being but very little inferior to the angels—not much below the Son of God. It has ever been the character of unrenewed men to have a God just like themselves, and to pare down the divinity of Jesus Christ to the insignificant standard of mere men; or, to raise himself to the standard of the

incarnate God. Now, sirs, you may say that I err upon this subject. If I err, I err with one hundred million out of two hundred millions who profess Christianity; if I err, I err with the great apostle of the Gentiles, rising upon an angel's wing to the third heaven; if I err, it is with the two millions of martyrs who sank amid the waves of the boiling cauldron, who have passed from the death-bed of torture, or through the flashing flames of martyrdom, in triumph, to the bosom of the living God. If I err, it is with that great company which no man can number, who have entered the spirit land, and now partake of the joys of the Lord, who came to this sin-cursed world, not to wash us from our sins in the waters of baptism, not in the Ganges, nor in the Jordan, but in his own precious blood, and unto him be praise, glory and dominion for ever and ever. Rather than, serpent-like, crawl in the dust, with the Socinian and Pelagian, I am determined, if I am in error upon this subject, to die in error! With the guides who have gone before me, with the lights that God took down from his throne, in the night of time, and hung out in the great hall of the universe, to illumine the world—rather than sink into the dust of this God-dishonoring and soul-destroying error, I will rise upon the pinions of faith and love, and soar beyond the dark realities of this world.

Have I not shown, beyond successful contradiction, the truth of my proposition, against the cavils, objections, and sophisms of my opponent? If the present assembly will not do me justice, in relation to my argument, unborn millions will come from the womb of time, who will read this debate, and say, there was one man who stood up and declared, in opposition to many, the truth—not as he found it upon the pages of Watts, of Calvin's Institutes, Wiseman's Confession of Faith—but upon the pages of the *Bible*. This book was the pillow of my dying mother's head, while the angels sung her soul to sleep in the arms of Jesus. I am a Bible man. I draw my divinity, not from the musty tomes of theology, not from Calvin, or Luther, or Fuller, or Bunyan. I respect their erudition, their piety, and cherish with grateful heart their memory, for the good they have accomplished in days gone by; but, give me my Bible—the Book of books. Though I am poor, with the Bible, I am rich; though I am rich, without my Bible, I am poor. Place me in a dungeon with my Bible, that dungeon becomes a palace; surround me with all the elegancies that art can furnish, or the magnificence which imagination can conceive, the pleasure that wealth can purchase, and deny me this book, and my life would be a desert, without one single oasis to relieve its gloom. Let me read

it literally, figuratively, parabolically, symbolically, by the means of interpretation which heaven has given me, it is all that I desire. My opponent is a book man, a Bible man; he has been preaching and exhorting upon the unity of Christians, upon the one faith, and one baptism, the one word—yet he comes forward and makes baptism the *sine qua non* to the salvation of the soul, which Jesus Christ never intended, which pares down the depravity of man, which makes infants go to heaven upon their own purity, and adult men become sinful merely by their practice. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FRANKLIN'S FOURTH REPLY.]

The hour is rather late, and were it not for the fact that I have engaged in the discussion of this proposition, I would not feel inclined to reply to such a speech as you have just listened to. It carries its own refutation with it. When rant, hyperbole, fustian, bombast, and mere assertion, are given by Webster as a definition of the term argument, I will accord to the gentleman the merit of having produced an argumentative discourse, and not before. I have never, in all my life, seen such an instance of arrogance as he has presented this evening.

Professing to stand up here upon equality in discussing the great matters pertaining to the kingdom of God—pretending to be a minister of Jesus Christ—he turns around and addresses me as an unconverted, unregenerate, and totally depraved sinner, and asks me politely to repent and become a gentlemanly divine Christian, like his “most potent, grave, and reverend” self!! I confess that I will fail in my entire judgment, if the community at large are to be influenced and controlled by such fulsome, self-lauded, puerile remarks as he has this day made. Feeling that they are fully capable of placing a proper estimate both on the man and his productions, I shall not detain you with any further reference to this kind of thing so far as it relates to myself. I try in all my public exhibitions to say as little as possible personally. God knows, and a great many of the children of God in these states are acquainted with my character, and so far as my life is concerned, I can say before God, to whom I trust I have submitted my soul unsullied, that I can go to any community yet, where I have ever been, and can apply to the community for a statement concerning my good deportment; and if my friend can do the same—if he can furnish an unbroken phalanx of good referees, it will be time enough for him to exhort me to be converted and stand where I can do good by the side of him.

Mr. Fisher. This is a downright imputation upon my character.

Mr. Franklin. I know it is a pretty severe case, and the remedy must be proportioned to the disease. I will not give calomel if I can help it, as I am a little opposed to that murderous practice.

The gentleman comes forward in his closing address and declares that the Baptists do not believe in the depravity I have been discussing, and I have no doubt there are many Baptists here who will bear me witness in not believing any such depravity. But, now he would have us believe that his depravity is a different kind, it is not that old kind of depravity I have been talking about. His proposition, which he comes here to debate, calls it *total hereditary depravity*. I turn over to the dictionary and find that the first definition is, "corruption; vitiated state;" the second is, "vitiating state of the heart." Now, recollect he applies this to infants. I deny broadly, and openly, and unequivocally, that a new-born infant, or such as Jesus alluded to when he said "of such is the kingdom of heaven," is wicked. There is no passage in the oracles of God that declares any wickedness on the part of an infant. But I have not given all the definition, viz., "corruption of moral principle." What! total corruption of moral principle in a new-born infant? He says the infant inherits moral putrefaction from its mother, but

he was very careful how he attributed thiſ sin to the mother. There is no ambiguity in the dictionary definitions. The word total means wholly, complete, entire, undivided; it is not any partial depravity, or partial corruption of the moral principles; it is not a partially vitiated state of the heart, but it is total depravity in the roundest, the fullest, completest sense. Now, there can be no backing out from that. But he forgets all this in the latter part of his speech, and comes up and proclaims against the doctrine that only pleads for a partial depravity, and all the vices and corruptions connected with this baptism for the remission of sins comes up before his imagination and haunts him to a considerable extent. Now, I want you to remember that the question at issue, is not whether man is sinful, but whether he is one mass of corruption. All references made in the Bible to man's corruption are concerning his own personal transgressions, and not the sins he has inherited from his mother. Just think of a person claiming to have the heart of a man or a gentleman, who would turn around and blame his mother for his own sins, and declare that he was conceived in sin and by her brought forth in iniquity, without acknowledging his own accountability, his own guilt, personal sins against God Almighty. So much then in regard to the definition of the doctrine.

I want to follow the gentleman along a little before I shall take hold of the main subject independent of his speech. He quotes the expression again: "They have gone out of the way." I ask any man of common intelligence, if there can be any such thing as having gone out of the way unless a person is first in the way? Tell me what is the meaning of it, if it does not imply that they were in the way when they were little infants? When God declares that they have gone out of the way, and that there is no good in them, is he talking about infants? He does not blame infants, for they have done no wrong; they are neither to be praised or censured; they are in a state of innocence and purity; they are without sin, moral corruption or guilt. The question may arise, what do they lack of being prepared for heaven? Why, what they lost in Adam. They go down to the grave, and the blood of Jesus Christ will bring them up from the dead, they being sinless as when he said, "of such is the kingdom of heaven." There is not a man on earth who can consistently say they are not prepared for heaven.

But I must notice some of my friend's splendid thoughts. He calls on me to tell him who set the example of sin before Cain was a murderer. If he had been right familiar with the language of Jesus Christ, he would have read

of another murderer, who lived before Cain. The Lord Jesus Christ, in speaking of the Devil, says he was a murderer from the beginning, and he set the example of murdering and lying. He is the father of liars, and was a murderer from the beginning. Cain was misled by his false and illusive teachings and wicked example. My friend wants to know how sin got into the world, and seems to talk about it as if it was a disease with which Adam was inflicted, and which spread like a contagion down through the whole race. The New Testament says, explicitly, that sin is a transgression of the law. If I can get salvation, through the blood of the covenant, for my own sins, I am not afraid that any other sins will come up against me. As sin is a transgression of the law, the man who sins violates the clear commandment of Jesus Christ. Sin is conceived in his heart, it comes from himself alone, and sinks his soul into condemnation before God.

I believe I have now noticed the principal items in my friend's speech, so far as they bear upon the question at issue, and will, therefore, make a general review of the whole case.

I will remind you, in the first place, that my friend attempts no reply to my arguments, and not even pays the slightest attention to the passages of Scripture which I quote in defense of my position. He disregarded what Paul

said in relation to unregenerate persons, neither did he call your attention to the "refiners' fire and the fullers' soap;" but he stood up and talked long, loud and boisterous, in regard to partial depravity. He can not be made to perceive degrees in depravity as the apostle did, but it must be entirely total and hereditary too. When I instanced the beautiful illustration in the third chapter of Malachi, to show that God intended to purify the people, to separate the gold from the dross, which could not be done if there was nothing but the latter, he sets it aside, as he has done all the other passages, without attempting to reply to them, and says, "I have established my argument, and you will have to overturn the pillars of the universe before you can get over it;" and he trembles in every part of his diminutive body, when he tells you that I may have from now to eternity to establish my proposition. He does not pay any attention to the principal arguments on which I have relied; but he, with a self-complacent air, tells his brethren he hopes I will repent, for it will take me from now to eternity to refute his arguments! I can not let some of his bragadocia pass by. He has had a debate with five of my brethren, and the greatest man of them all, Wm. B. Clark (about whom I know considerable), was, by his gigantic arguments and mighty towering

powers, converted; and now he would have me be converted and baptized, "like a man," in the same way, and come forward, and, upon a profession of my faith, will take and baptize me into—the Baptist church! I do wonder if my friend thought God's eyes were upon him when he was talking in that manner. Did he think that the all-searching Spirit of the living God saw him? He says, of all those five men with whom he debated, I have produced the most confused arguments; that I am not only the most limited in understanding, and unfortunate of all, but am actually doing the Reformation an injury in this country! Now, is this a sincere, genuine, solemn, Christian, prayerful discourse, to a dying people? Are the heavens to look down upon this, and chronicle it as a pious, sincere deed? I ask, in the name of reason and Almighty God, how are we to look upon it? What tender feelings he has, for fear the Reformation has been injured! He was telling you it was going down in our country; that it was a mere moonlight doctrine. Has he forgotten how he handled that subject a few moments? He implores that I shall give myself into his sacred hands! Would it not be a misfortune to injure such a cause as this? [A laugh.] I would injure any cause on earth, if I was just what he represented me to be. [Renewed laughter.] But my

friends know something of the life I have been trying to live, and they know that instead of trifling, and treating with a spirit of levity those glorious and eternal matters pertaining to the Christian religion—instead of trifling with the souls of the children of men, I have been for twenty years urging the claims of the Messiah—urging the necessity of a deep and genuine repentance, and a solemn surrender of their souls and bodies to the Lord Jesus Christ. And am I to be treated in this connection as if I were an infidel, as devoid of all feeling, every particle of conscience, and of all that pertains to a Christian, as one totally debased? I ask, in reason's name, what I have done in any section of the country to justify any man in treating me in such a style? I know that God's eye is upon me; that his all-searching Spirit beholds my heart, and knows whether there is within me an honest soul. He knows something of my labors, that I have been trying to turn sinners from darkness to light; for there is nothing that makes me feel that any man should trifle with the solemn and glorious realities of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and things that pertain to the kingdom of God and the salvation of our world. When I look upon my Baptist brethren who are here this evening, I can see the same tender regard, and the same kind desire, for the happiness and salvation of all. When I

think of the members who live in the same favored community, in the same gospel, with the same God, and the same Holy Spirit pervading their hearts, what a misfortune, what a lamentable thing it is that men should be in your midst who love discussion better than they love Christ, he who prayed that you might be one in the same body, and that there might be no divisions among you? I ask, in reason's name, are they real friends, who would cause a separation between husband and wife, and would not allow them to come together at the Lord's table? Are they real friends, who would make them believe that they must be baptized upon a profession of faith before they could enter the covenant? Should these advocates be regarded as their true friends—friends of piety, friends of religion? And they would teach us that we are totally depraved. God Almighty knows we have evidence sufficient in the holy oracles that the world was deeply depraved, but still it was not *totally* depraved; and there was some good in the servants of God. There was no time when all men were totally depraved. Those that are dead in sin have power to believe, to understand, and to receive the gospel—have power to receive the Savior, to obey, to avail themselves of the great salvation which is through the blood of the everlasting covenant; and, the

reason why they will be consigned to eternal condemnation, will be because they will not avail themselves of the grace which God has given, and not in consequence of the sin of Adam. This is the reason. Light has come into the world; they have power to receive the light, but they love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil. They want to be on the side of sin, not by necessity, but by choice and practice, and will be condemned for their own sin—obstinate rejection of the kingdom of the everlasting God. How different is this from the system my friend advocates, which, let us look at once more: “Man is dead to sin.” He did not ask what the atonement was for, if man was not lost. I should be greatly mistaken if a great many professors of religion are not lost, when they manifest such unloveliness, such unkindness, censoriousness, on such occasions as this. Because we desire the prevalency of universal love and fellowship among the children of God, and communion among the Disciples, it is instanced as a proof of depravity of heart, and the necessity of a savior of mercy and of grace; and the prayer is offered, that, as we are under sin and in unbelief, that the Lord may have mercy upon us! We do not admit that all men were totally depraved; that man had no ability to do any thing, but merely that he was lost, and could not be saved without the

mercy of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the gospel of the blessed Redeemer; and that, consequently, Jesus died for our sins, made an atonement for the world, made his soul an offering for sin, became a great victim, hung between the heavens and the earth, died for our sins to bring us to God, and, after this is done, the minister of God comes and tells the sinner that God poured out his blood for you. He died, that you might have everlasting life! Will you love him because he first loved you? He is totally dead in trespasses and sins, or else he could not bear this faith that brings the love of God to his soul. He is sorry, and receives into an honest soul this pure belief. My friend found it convenient never to say a word about it. He had rather waste his time in idle declamation than come back and refer to my arguments. Phillip did not preach Campbellism, nor Baptism, nor old land-markism; he did not say a word about things of this kind, for he preached the Lord Jesus Christ, who died for our sins, and who made his soul an offering for sin, and it made such an impression upon the heart of the eunuch, that he exclaimed, "What doth hinder me to be baptized?" Well, if my friend had been there, he would have said, "Tell your experience; I will sit as judge here, and if it be a good old-fashioned Baptist experience, I will baptize

you, and if it is not, you will have to wait a while and get a better one." But what did the old preacher say? "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest." The man answered solemnly, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." And they both went down into the water. Brother Helm, don't you think it easier to preach as the Scripture reads, than otherwise? We have nothing else to do but to preach straight forward the word of the living God, as we find it in the Bible. Let us have it as it was in the beginning. They both went down into the water, and he baptized him, and when he came up out of the water, he went on his way rejoicing. Glory to God! I have found the Messiah—him of whom the prophets have spoken. I have found Jesus, who poured out his blood for my sins! I come to the preacher and tell him that I love Christ; that my heart and feelings are changed, and I ask him what I should do to be saved, and he tells me to believe that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and he would baptize me. Tell me if the apostles, in converting sinners, preached total hereditary depravity? Go and hear the preaching on the day of Pentecost; go to Solomon's portico; go follow Phillip down to Samaria. Did he preach it to the Gentiles? Where did they preach such a doctrine? They preached to them that God had included them

all under sin; that they had become unprofitable servants, but that he intended to have mercy upon them all. Will you receive it? Will you have his great salvation? Will you go into the covenant and be saved? Now, can't you see the necessity we have for an atonement? If there had been none, even the little infants would have been locked up in the prison-house of death, and the saints too. All we poor sinners, in the last day, never could have obtained pardon for our personal transgressions. But God, in infinite compassion, pitied our poor world. "O," says he, "I will have mercy upon them. I love and pity them. They have no ability to save themselves. I will send my Son, one who is able and mighty to save all who trust and go to him. I will send him to the world." He came to the world, filled his mission, ascended into heaven, and was crowned King of kings and Lord of lords. Would the apostle have appealed to the Gentiles, on the day of Pentecost, if he knew there were no good and honest hearts among them? Would he have said, "Save yourselves from this untoward generation"? O, believe the gospel. Arise! embrace the salvation of Jesus, and be saved through the gospel of Christ. This doctrine is extended from the beginning to the final amen of the New Testament—to John, that lovely disciple, who, in place of teaching

Christians that they must not commune and fellowship with one another, that the seeds of dissension must be sown between husband and wife, said to the children of God, "Little children, love one another," and reminded them of the words of Jesus: "By this shall all men know that you are my disciples, if you love one another." That good old disciple, when about to utter the last words of the New Testament— "And the Spirit and the bride say, come; and let him that heareth say, come; and let him that is athirst come: and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely,"—if he had considered that men were totally depraved, he would not have said any thing about coming, for no one totally depraved ever could come. That invitation of God implies that man had power to come to him and receive salvation through the blood of Jesus Christ. This, then, is the word, the Scripture, and the Holy Ghost, preached by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, at the beginning. Is it, therefore, necessary that men, who have received the gospel—converted men—must be baptized again before they can have the honor of sitting down to the Lord's table and receiving the sacrament? Brother Fisher, is it possible that we, who have received our glorious Savior, acknowledged our absolute dependence on him, our inability to be saved without his grace, our

faith in his atonement, in his death for our sins, and have loved him, and expect to love him while we live—is it necessary that we go through senseless, spiritless, and unscriptural ceremony, before we can be received as Christians, and come to the Lord's table? We have had men among us who have died in the faith, their souls beaming with the hope of immortal and everlasting life, and must we be insulted and challenged as unregenerate and unconverted, when their noble souls were cheered by faith? Must they be insulted now that they are lying peaceably in their graves—their righteous souls in paradise? And that holy man, the beloved Johnson, who said on his dying bed, "I have lived upon my religion, and I can die upon my religion"? We ask you, in God's name, in the name of the Bible, in the name of the blood of the everlasting covenant, in the name and hope of the resurrection of the dead, in the name of the love of God that swells our heart, why we can not possess the spirit of him who was reviled by the Jews? Let us try and humble ourselves in the dust of humility and suffer shame for his name. Let us strike adherence to his holy cause! O, you Christian! lift up your head, for the day of your redemption draws nigh, and the hope of Christ swells and enlarges more and more, and the glorious prospect of everlasting life and love expands to

infinity! Here sits an old brother, who has been trying to serve God in the ministry for more than fifty-three years. He stood where my friend now does—pleading total hereditary depravity, and the doctrine that saints can not fall from grace; but solemn study of the holy Bible, his long and prayerful life, has taught him that this vain and self-righteous doctrine, that Christians are invulnerable, is contrary to the teachings of the Word. I exhort you not to allow any thing which has been said this evening to mar your friendship with your Baptist brethren. You know that some of them are good men, and if they point out your faults, try to correct them and render yourself worthy of their fellowship. God knows we have no more goodness than we ought to have, and my prayer is that every day we will become better prepared to see our Redeemer. If we are faithful in our glorious work, we will at last see the grand consummation of all our hopes. I have listened to the charges and allegations made by my opponent to insult me, and witnessed his endeavors before to-day. I have been tried in this way twice. I have been down to the door of death, and, while I can not claim any superior goodness, still I will trust that my Lord will receive me—I know I was ready to go to his presence. I hope my friend will try to stand in readiness, and be prepared when

the great summons shall come to lie down in the grave, and from thence will arise to dwell with the Lamb of God for evermore. My prayer and exhortation is, that you may study the things that make peace, love, and charity—that you may turn away from the man who would make you believe an untruth concerning your eternal salvation. Do not bring forward any hypocritical plea to excuse yourself, for God knows whether we are sincere, whether we believe what we say or not; then, be true to him, love and serve him, die in the faith, and you will reap undreamed of glories in the world to come. [*Time expired.*]

END OF THE SECOND PROPOSITION.

DEBATE

ON THE

APOSTACY OF THE SAINTS.

PROPOSITION THIRD.

Do the Scriptures teach that the saints can apostatize, fall from grace, and be lost? Mr. Franklin affirms—Mr. Fisher denies.

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 10 o'clock, A. M.

[MR. FRANKLIN'S OPENING ADDRESS.]

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am happy to see the people in good spirits, and to find my opponent in good health and fine trim for discussion this morning. I hope we shall have a happy and interesting day of it.

The proposition, which has been read in your hearing, is so clear and unambiguous that it scarcely needs that I should spend a moment in defining it. I will, therefore, make a very brief reference to the terms of it. The word saint is used in the sense of Christian, follower of Christ, child of God. Brother Fisher says

this is right. By falling from grace, we merely mean to fall from Christianity; apostatize, depart from Christ; and being lost, is to be finally cast away—lost from heaven and all the blessings and gracious privileges and infinite hopes of the world to come. I think we shall not have any collision in regard to the terms. I will mention also that I do not expect to trim down my proposition, and try to get a less one than the one already proposed in the correspondence. I am prepared to argue it in its clearest terms, and to defend it in all its fullness; and I want my friend to sharpen his mind and tongue to the best acumen he can command, and to give the best turn he has.

I have discovered in the minutes of the Bracken Association a definition of the perseverance of the saints. I believe I will read it. Art. 9: "We believe that such only are believers as endure unto the end; that their persevering attachment to Christ is the grand mark which distinguishes them from superficial professors; that a special providence watches over their welfare, and they are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation." I read this definition of perseverance to show you how exceedingly cautious the Association was not to step out and endorse the position my friend occupies on the present occasion. This definition does not declare that the saints can

not fall from grace, but it simply asserts that their final perseverance is an evidence of their true belief. I do not doubt all who persevere are true believers; but the question is, whether true believers can apostatize—whether they can fall—whether they can be lost? I claim that they can, and I intend to try to prove it in this discussion. But my friend stands up and declares that they can not; that it is not in the power of a saint to fall; he can not do any thing by which he can forfeit his standard in the kingdom of God, by which he can lose heaven and fall down into hell. Fatal mistake! Now, I do not know how men feel generally, but, I confess, that ever since I have been making some feeble efforts to serve God, if I have had a consciousness, it has been that of a possibility of falling, and the necessity of constant, watchful, prayerful vigilance, to keep from falling; and if I understand any thing of the spirit of the explicatory part of the New Testament, of the exhortations of the apostles, and warnings of Jesus to the disciples, that the meaning of this is, that Christians should be careful—that they can not be too vigilant and persevering, lest they apostatize, fall, and be lost. I believe I have now the issue distinctly before us, and I shall proceed to lay before you some arguments to which I do hope my friend will give his respectful attention; and, if he

can not recollect them, I hope some of his brethren will note the passages for him, and I shall not consider it any obtrusion at all.

My first argument I believe I will base upon the case of Simon, the sorcerer, and, the reason why I bring his case forward is, because my opponent, in his logic, proved that Simon was converted, and consequently he was a Christian. I am going to show you he did prove it. Do you remember that he quoted the expression, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." What did he quote that for? Why, to prove that just as soon as a man believes he has everlasting life, he is converted. Well, what does the sacred historian say about Simon? Why, that Simon, hearing, believed; and my friend insists that just as soon as a man believes he has everlasting life—even before he is baptized. So, here is Simon a convert to Christianity, according to my friend's theory. Did he not declare he was converted the moment he believed? And Christ said he believed; and if the word of the living God is to be relied on, and its application to this is correct, he was a Christian saint. But now, for the sake of making the case as clear as I can, I will grant he was converted, and baptized; and there is no one scrap in the oracles of God that intimates any thing else than that Simon was converted—that he was in the faith and in

the kingdom, and was brought to the enjoyment of the spiritual life of Christianity. Peter and John being sent for, went down to Samaria, and laid their hands on them (I do not know how my friend harmonizes that; they had been converted, but had not received the Holy Ghost), and they spake with tongues and prophesied, and gave evidence that they had the miraculous powers of the living God imparted them by the imposition of hands. Simon sees the supernatural power, turns around to the apostles, and offers them money to give him that power, that he may give others the Holy Spirit by the laying on of his own hands. Peter makes a charge¹ against him, saying, "I perceive thou art in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity." Simon had been converted, according to my friend's teaching, and Peter is not going to challenge him who has been converted. "I perceive now you are in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity, because thou hast thought the gift of God may be purchased with money." Well, is that all? Says Peter: "Pray God, if perhaps you may be safely converted." I am mistaken, I have got my friend's theory into my head; it is, "Pray God, if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee! He did not say *thoughts*, brother Fisher. Simon, in return, says, "Pray the Lord, that these things which

you have spoken may not come upon me." I solemnly believe that, had brother Fisher been called upon to preach his funeral sermon, he would have said that Simon went to heaven! But he did not believe that he has gone to heaven, because Simon was baptized and converted the way we convert people. He has a different way of converting people than that of Phillip. Simon was soundly converted, but, notwithstanding that, he sinned, and hence the severe reprimand which he received from the apostle.

But, leaving Simon, I will call your attention to Ezekiel xviii. 19. I will try to find my doctrine in the Bible, and I do not expect to give any long comments on it: "Yet say ye, Why? doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father? When the son hath done that which is lawful and right, and hath kept all my statutes, and hath done them, he shall surely live. The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him. But if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die. All his transgressions

that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him: in his righteousness that he hath done, he shall live. Have I any pleasure at all that the wickēd should die? saith the Lord God; and not that he should return from his ways, and live? But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live?" That don't sound like my friend's doctrine. Paul says, "He that standeth, let him take heed lest he fall." But let us hear the prophet: "All his righteousness that he hath done, shall not be mentioned; in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die." Can any thing be clearer and more unequivocal? My friend would have said to the good old prophet, "You are a little mistaken, the righteous can not turn away from their righteousness and die. Don't you see you have got out of the way here. It is true, I confess, you speak by the spirit of inspiration, but you are wrong. A saint can not fall; it is impossible for him to die in his sin." Turn to John xvii.: "I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me: and they have kept thy word. Now they have known that all things, whatsoever thou has given me,

are of thee. For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me. I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which thou has given me; for they are thine." Don't you see the distinction he makes between those the Father gave him, and the world? "And all mine are thine, and thine are mine; and I am glorified in them. And now I am no more in the world; but these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name, those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are." I think he was a believer in prayer: his doctrine anticipates the necessity for prayer, and he is not going to say the saints are hedged in and braced up so they never can fall. The Lord, just before he suffered, prayed that believers might be kept from falling. "And now I am no more in the world; but these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name, those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are. While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name; those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition, that the Scriptures might be fulfilled." There is one of them lost, and I

think it would be well enough to exhort the balance of us to pray, serve God, and be vigilant, lest some more of us be likewise lost. I wonder how much piety it infuses into the world to make people believe that they can not fall? Did not Judas, one of the apostolic ministry, fall, and was lost? I don't know what my friend will say to this, unless he tries to prove that the Savior kept Judas in his name, and that he did not fall from any thing but total depravity. I don't know any thing else he can make out of it. If he says Judas was not a saint, I will get one whom he will admit was a saint. I allude to Paul. I tell you he was in the fire. Whether he was a saint or not, he told his experience under circumstances calculated to make a man tell an honest experience. They tried him at the whipping-post five times; they tried him by laying his head on the block, and cutting it off. He was a saint. Now, the question is, did he preach that saints can fall from grace? Did he say, "I stand here firmly, and by no possibility under the heavens can I fall." Just turn to 1 Cor. ix. 27: "But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be cast away." Brother Fisher would have said, "It is all nonsense, brother Paul; you and I are saints, and we can not fall

from grace, no matter whether we labor to keep our bodies under subjection or not. We may take a little brandy, we may steal or murder, but we can not by any possibility fall from grace; there is no danger; the thing is absolutely impossible." That good old man, that fervent preacher of Jesus Christ, who was so solemnly tried, and whose name stood above all others in the catalogue of men of God, said he might be a "cast-away;" and I think brother Fisher and myself had better be a little more careful in future.

I call the gentleman's attention to 2 Peter i. 1-5. The apostle is here speaking of persons who have been made partakers of a divine nature: "And besides this giving all diligence, add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity." You are not to judge a man's love merely by what he says, but by his actions. If he tries to induce harmony, love, communion, and fellowship among the children of God, it is not necessary that he should say he loves every body. Peter says, "He that lacketh these things is blind and can not see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his own sins. Wherefore, the rather brethren, give diligence to make your

calling and election sure; for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall." Brother Fisher would have said: "Stop, Peter, the election was from eternity—they can not fall." How these little contingencies are in the way of this "iron jacket" doctrine which my friend comes up here to defend. "If ye do these things, ye shall never fall." And what is the result if you do not these things? Why, that you will fall, just as certain as God is in heaven. You may plead that you can not fall, from this time to eternity, but disregard the warnings of God, and he will depart from you, and you will no longer stand. But here is another remark of Peter's: "For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." Now, this faith, repentance, and baptism, does not take a man into the everlasting kingdom—they are only the initiatory steps. Now, if my friend pleases, I want him to say, whether you do these things or not you shall get into the everlasting kingdom. The apostle hypothecates the whole upon the contingency that they do these specified things.

I want the gentleman's attention for a few moments to a passage of Scripture, and I suppose that we ought to have preached it before we commenced, for by so doing, we might have been saved from some little improprieties: "And

if any man or any angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Yes, sir, any man who inserts in the word of God what is not in the Bible, will bring that curse upon him.

Now I want to read you a sentence from the minutes of a Baptist Association, to which, as God is my judge, I would not put my hand for worlds upon worlds. Look here if you please, and see that the interpolation is italicised.

[The extract from the minutes referred to has been lost.—REPORTER.]

Here, then, you see, that Baptist preachers interpolate, and thus bring the curse of God upon themselves; and he will not excuse them because they lay the flattering unction to their souls that they can not fall. Every man who loves God also loves his word, and if he is commanded to humble his face in the dust, he will do it without hesitation. Do you remember, at the close of the sacred canon, it is said, "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." How every preacher ought to tremble when he looks at that expression. "And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which

are written in this book." How can a man have a part taken out of the book of life unless he has a part in it. And having a part taken out, signifies that they may apostatize, does it not? If my friend considers these matters, he will find subjects sufficiently solemn to hold his mind to the subject of the discourse, and not to personal reflections.

I call his attention to Galatians v. 1: "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." What is the use of that caution? the saints can not help but stand fast. Again he says, "Behold, I, Paul, say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." If you go back under circumcision, if you apostatize from Christianity, Christ shall profit you nothing. There is a little more: "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." My friend says you can not fall from grace.

Mr. Fisher. Amen.

Mr. Franklin. And now he says amen to it, when the apostle says a man *can* fall from grace. I am not going to make an hour's speech, and give nothing that touches the subject.

Now, sir, I want the gentleman's closest, most solemn, and candid examination. I want him to exert all the powers of "exegesis" (I believe

that is one of the learned terms he used), and enter into the subject and tell us what is to be done with this passage of Scripture, if his theory is to be regarded. In Romans xi. Paul was talking about the Jews as branches. He says they were broken off, that had once been in Abraham. As Hosea expresses it: "Thou wilt say then, the branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in." Well, "because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear." If you want to find the whole of the matter, take the history of Israel after the crossing of the Red Sea, where they sinned again in every respect—where three hundred and twenty thousand fell; and there you get a clear statement of the whole premises. My friend says that the saints are now grafted into Abraham, are children of God by faith in Abraham, and that they can not be broken off. Well, to such men the apostle turns around and says: "Let us therefore take heed, if God spared not the natural branches, take care lest he spare not thee." So I say to every man infected with the conceit that he can not fall, ought to evince great propriety in his deportment—he ought to reflect the image of Jesus in every word and action. I acknowledge myself to be fallible and liable to fall, and am constantly laboring to stand upright; and it would not be impossi-

ble that I should commit some blunders. Now, take heed, says the apostle, "If God spared not the natural branches take care lest he spare not you." For he has said to the Jews, do not boast of your relationship to Abraham; and to the Gentile, do not look back to the Jew who had fallen, but take care if he spared not the Jew, who, through his unbelief, fell—if he was broken off on account of his unbelief, take care lest he spare not you. Here then, I have in this passage an evidence that those who were the people of God apostatized, and the Gentiles, who were not God's people, have been grafted into Abraham, and are now the people of the living God; and consequently the prophecy of Hosea is fulfilled in respect to that matter.

It is a little singular to see a fellow mortal, whose breath is in his nostrils, laying claims to infallibility, placing himself in the scale of creation higher than the angels whom God even did not spare. "For, if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down into hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgement; and spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly; and turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after

should live ungodly; and delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked: the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." He hypothecates every thing upon a man's *continuing* in holiness. If the high and shining spirits before the throne of the eternal Lord were cast down to hell, shall a mortal stand up and claim before his God, that he can not fall and be lost? I never knew any thing more unreasonable and contrary to all that is rational, than this theory of my friend.

But I want to call his attention to Paul's letter to the Hebrews. This letter is an argument against every position my friend occupies. Indeed, I would like to know if the spirit of all the New Testament is not against him? He says, if you do his word, you shall continue in the Son, and in the Father; but if you do not, you will not continue in the Son and Father. Hebrews ii: "Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip."

My friend did not believe his doctrine himself. He has made such a tremendous effort to keep me from turning away from the doctrine, that the sweat has dropped from his face. He is afraid saints can fall. I know a great many evidences around me that others fall,

and I think it would be better for him to get up and try to prove that they *can* fall, and endeavor to strengthen them so they can not fall. But he says, you have no power to do any thing by which you can fall. I will tell you that if any thing is precious there is some danger of losing it. There *is* danger. Let us, therefore, give more earnest heed to the things which we have heard. "For, if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him—God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?" Now, what is the meaning of all that? If saints can not fall from grace, there is no meaning in it. The apostles admonished Christians that the enemy was on the alert, that sin is dangerous, and no man ought to trifle with or make light of it. I am informed that brother Helm preached a discourse, showing the necessity of trying to avoid sin, from its awful character. That doctrine ought to be preached to all men. "Take heed lest the holy doctrine which you have from the Lord Jesus Christ, you let slip." My friend says we can not

neglect so great salvation; we are in no danger; we can not fall." Let him turn to Hebrews iii. 11-19: "So I swear in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest. Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God. But exhort one another daily, while it is called to-day, lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end. While it is said, to-day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation. For some, when they had heard, did provoke; howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses. But with whom was he grieved forty years? was it not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness? And to whom swear he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief. Now, let us, Christians, therefore, fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into rest, any of us should come short of it." It seems to me I can not open the Bible in any place but what I find an everlasting refutation of my friend's doctrine. The apostle goes on to say, "For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them, but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith

in them that heard it. For we, which have believed, do enter into rest, as he said, as I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest, although the works were finished from the foundation of the world. For he spake in a certain place, of the seventh day, in this wise: And God did rest the seventh day from all his works. And in this place again: If they shall enter into my rest." Don't you see he keeps that "if" in the way all the time. I have only time to read the sixth verse of the sixth chapter of Hebrews: "If they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to open shame." [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FISHER'S FIRST REPLY.]

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The degree of happiness which I feel this morning arises from the fact that my opponent is in a much better humor than he was on Saturday night, when he most egregiously failed in answering my arguments—his replies being about as irrelevant to the subject as the comet or the moon in eclipse. I am glad to find that his nerves are quiet this morning, and

I also feel a lamb-like disposition, for I returned to my "sweet home," on the banks of the beautiful Ohio, and there reposed amid the rich perfume of the flowers and the blossoms of the trees, whilst the angels encamped about my dwelling. I am glad to find my opponent so well fortified this morning; and from that air of self-confidence which he has assumed, and from the multiplied dogmatical assertions which he has made before you, I judge that he imagines he is strong, and that this day I must die a shameful death on the gallows, "for an old sheep or a lamb." Well, as my wife's health was a little better, I thought I would bring her, my little daughter, and a servant girl, whom we prize very highly, to see the execution upon this occasion. I observed that my friend was well fortified. He has at his command two debates of his own with one Mr. Hume, an old Hard-Shell Baptist, and one with some John Doe and Richard Roe. I have on this occasion to debate with Mr. Benjamin Franklin, bound in a human skin, and also bound in cloth. I think I had better fortify myself a little. I shoulder this good old-fashioned book, the family Bible, which has annoyed my opponent so much during this debate. I take a hymn book, published by Alexander Campbell, Barton W. Stone, Scott, and John S. Johnson, and also a little book, pub-

lished by the American Tract Society; and, with these missiles, I hope to be able to defend myself against the attacks of this Magnus Apollo of the current Reformation.

I do not doubt the sincerity of my opponent, when he says he believes that the saints can apostatize and fall from grace. I am of the opinion that he believes this more firmly than any position he has taken in this discussion, for he is better prepared than he has been on any previous proposition; and that, like him, his followers are sincere in their infatuation. I am inclined to believe, from the circumstance, that thousands of them practice it, if we may be permitted to judge from the morally dilapidated condition of the current Reformation throughout the length and breadth of the land. But there are honorable exceptions who practice upon my plan, and the most of whom, I would state, have gone from the Baptist denomination, or from the Presbyterians, to the Disciples. Our friend, I know, is glad to get such recruits, for we have before us one who has been rocked by a thousand storms, and still stands firm, and will, by the grace of God, I trust, endure to the end.

I will now notice that to which, in the first place, my friend called my attention, viz., the case of Simon Magus, the sorcerer; and I reckon, as he believed and was baptized, my opponent

will not object if I should say, Simon the sorcerer was his *brother*. He brought forward a passage which I quoted in proof of sinners being justified by faith in Jesus Christ. Now, have I asserted, throughout this whole debate, that an individual is saved by faith alone? And did he not misrepresent me, when he tried to prove that Simon was a true believer, by quoting the text that I have used during this discussion—"He that believeth on the Son of God hath everlasting life"? By the way, it seems that I can make a much better defence for Simon than my opponent has done. I will prove, by an inspired witness, that he was in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity; that he was a consummate sorcerer; that his heart had never been changed, and that he was a baptized hypocrite. From my opponent's remarks during this discussion, we would infer that there was no such being as a hypocrite, or a self-righteous person; that all who believed and were baptized for the remission of their sins, were thoroughly converted. Simon figured largely in my opponent's speech, but throughout the entire length of it, did he bring forward one passage from the oracles of the living God, to prove that Simon was a saint? This is the first thing he must prove before he can establish the fall of a saint. It is not necessary to bring forward the ten thousand cautions which are

used in the Bible, and which all Christians use, to prove that the saints can apostatize and fall from grace. But to the case in Acts viii. 20-23. "Peter said unto him, Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter; for thy heart is not right in the sight of God. Repent therefore of thy wickedness, and pray God if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee. For I perceive thou art in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." Now, if my friend had baptized this disciple of Philip, he would have claimed him as among the disciples. He says he was numbered among them. Don't you know a man may be numbered among the disciples, and yet not be truly one of them? Now, this sorcerer, magician, or necromancer, who had been practising his vile sorceries, saw how the gift of the Holy Spirit was conferred by the imposition of hands, and thought, that if he could bring to his aid this gift of the Holy Spirit, he would be capable of practising his deceptions with great success. He came forward and said he believed, like a gambler who came forward to one of the brethren of the Reformation, and said he believed that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God, and he was baptized for the remission of his sins. While he was sitting at the card-table

one day, he was asked if he had not been baptized for the remission of his sins. "O yes," said he; "but I tell you, boys, this gospel in the water is not the thing it's cracked up to be, for I can drink just as big a dram, and deal just as good a game as I did before." Now, I would not say that man had fallen from grace, but that he was a consummate hypocrite. He practised deception upon that innocent man who baptized him for the remission of his sins, and into the kingdom of Jesus Christ. I would say that the case of Simon is somewhat analogous to this case. I will give you my authority for this statement—Rev. Mr. Hendricks, whose character for veracity will not be called in question. This man, Simon, believed, he was baptized; but, mark you, did he receive the Holy Ghost? No, sirs, he did not. He could not have been a Christian until he came into its possession. Now, is it not strange that my opponent will have a man a Christian who has been baptized, but who has not received the Holy Spirit! And on the other hand, when I brought forward the case of Paul being filled with the Holy Ghost before baptism, and the case of Cornelius and his friends and kinsman, these were not Christians until they had been baptized for the remission of their sins. Now, is not this passing strange? Who can harmonize such logic as this? I intend to give

Simon a fair chance, and a better one to prove himself a Christian, than my opponent has done. The controversy now lies between Simon and Peter—between Mr. Campbell and my opponent, and not between Simon and myself. Peter said unto him, “Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity. I find you to be a great sinner. I perceive you are a baptized villain, a hypocrite, and your heart is not right in the sight of God. I will sustain the charge which I have brought against you. You would never have dared to offer money for the gift of God, if you had any part or lot in this matter, or if your heart had been right in the sight of God. I still say you are in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity.” In this dialogue I will give Simon the benefit of Mr. Campbell’s system, of which branch of theology my opponent is a representative. Simon, who was baptized, says in reply to Peter’s charges: “Did I not, by baptism, receive remission of my sins; and did you not preach, upon the day of Pentecost, that he that believeth and is baptized, shall receive remission of his sins?” Does not Mr. Franklin come forward, and without any equivocation whatever, boldly affirm that baptism is for the remission of sins; and

has not Mr. Campbell, in his *Millennial Harbinger*, *Extra*, page 34, said: "Remission of sins can not be enjoyed by any person before immersion"? Again, page 55: "All the saints are said to be saved by immersion. Being born again and being immersed, are the same thing. Regeneration and immersion are, therefore, but two names for the same thing." Mr. Franklin says a man enters into the kingdom by being baptized for the remission of his sins. "Yes," says Peter, "I did preach, upon the day of Pentecost, that he that believeth and is baptized should be saved; but I did not preach, as does Mr. Campbell, that he that believeth and is baptized, may be lost. I did say to the people, on the day of Pentecost, Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. Now, sir, you have professed faith, you have believed, and have been baptized, yourself being witness. You are not in possession of the Holy Spirit, because you offer to purchase with money the gift of God." This case of falling from grace is a mere subterfuge. I have proven that Simon was nothing but a sorcerer, a hypocrite, and all such are classed with drunkards, liars, whoremongers, gluttons, the vulgar and the vile; all which ungodly wretches will be driven from the presence of God, and from the glory of his power.

Let Mr. Franklin get around this case if he can; and if he proves to you that Simon was a Christian, that he received the gift of the Holy Ghost, then I will again prove to you that Paul and Cornelius were Christians before they were baptized for the remission of their sins. If Simon had known the paraphrase, he would have sung:

“Ho, every mother’s son, and daughter,
Here’s the gospel in the water.”

He would have pompously sung that couplet, which, by the way, I acknowledge is an invidious paraphrase upon the practice of the Disciples, by a Methodist minister by the name of Philips.

Now, I have shown you, beyond successful contradiction, that Simon was not a Christian. From what has he fallen? From the grace of sorcery? Has sorcery any grace in it? Did he obtain grace in the very act of baptism? Did he receive the gift of the Holy Ghost after he was baptized? No. Let Peter show you that the man was a hypocrite. Peter neither preached nor believed in the doctrine of falling from grace; but he said to the Jews on the day of Pentecost: “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. I have established, Simon, to your satisfaction, and you ought to confess it, that your heart is not right in the sight of God; that you are in the gall of bitterness and in

the bond of iniquity." I presume he directed him to an altar of error, as my friend would invidiously term the "mourners' bench," when this Simon called upon an inspired apostle to pray for him. Here we have apostolic example to pray for sinners, whether they are baptized or unbaptized. And what has Peter said in relation to the doctrine for which I am contending? Simon says, "Brother Peter, I claim to have the remission of my sins, and I can show the receipt in your own language." Peter says, "You can show part of the receipt, but the whole you can not produce; and, I aver, you have never obtained the gift of the Holy Spirit." "Why," says Simon, "did not Mr. Campbell say, in his debate with McCalla (page 137), that 'when an individual is born of water, he enters the world a second time as pure and unspotted as an angel?'" Peter: "I know Mr. Campbell has said that, but you have no part or lot in this matter. I say your heart is not right in the sight of God." Mr. Franklin says: "I will settle the whole matter—the man has miserably fallen from grace"! Peter says, in his first epistle, i. 5: "Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time." Let my opponent, if he can, establish in the face of this authority, his theory that this Simon, a canonized saint of his, fell from grace. What a pity

that my opponent, who believes so strongly in this doctrine, had not been present at that time, and persuaded Simon that he had better get into the eternal world, by some hook or crook, as soon as possible: for, if he lived ten minutes beyond that time he might fall from grace, and in his fallen state he would die and go to hell. "Why rely in the promises of Christ? You had better depart as soon as possible for the other world, lest you live an hour, fall from grace, die in your sins, and go to hell." What do you think of that, my brethren? There is a triumvirate against me on this occasion, while *I* have only called to my aid a very small missile in the form of a tract, and a hymn-book, printed by the Disciples, and now in current use among them.

I will now attend to his other case, in Ezekiel. My opponent has presumed all the time, that every man who is said to be righteous is clothed with the righteousness of Jesus Christ — that there is no such thing as a self-righteous man. Was there ever a more self-righteous man than the apostle Paul? The case that he brought forward, in Ezekiel, is paralleled by the case of Saul of Tarsus, who, as touching the law, was blameless. This man, in Ezekiel, was a righteous person under the law; but what saith the law concerning this righteous man? That figure in my friend's speech was literal,

which has walked forth here in such a pompous style and with such clumsy construction, does not say that this man fell—there is not a word of it in all the passage. We all know there are many cases stated hypothetically in the Scriptures of divine truth. Let him read the passage, and prove that he was a saint, and I can come nearer proving that he was a self-righteous man. Ezekiel xviii. 24, contains the gist of the controversy: “But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness (I say there is such a thing as a self-righteous man), and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live?” I would say no! he deserves to die, and will die, as certain as God is upon his throne. But I say no truly righteous man, clothed in the righteousness of Jesus Christ, will ever die. Such a self-righteous man as Saul of Tarsus, in whose heart was madness, murder, persecution, and the venom of the viper (and if my opponent had preached his funeral, he would have preached him right into Father Abraham’s bosom, when he should have been with his brother Dives in hell, calling, perhaps, for one drop of water to cool his parched tongue), was not then in a saved condition; and if he was, why was he afterwards converted and made a saint? “All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned: in his tres-

pass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die." So say I. So much for this passage.

Now, I might bring forward several other hypothetical cases in order to set aside any argument my friend might adduce from this verse of Ezekiel. "If a man or angel from heaven, preach any other gospel than that which I have preached, let him be accursed." Am I to infer from this, that Gabriel or any other angel will come down and preach any other gospel in opposition to that of Jesus Christ, which has been established by the fulfillment of a thousand prophecies, by the performance of a thousand bright and shining miracles? Am I to suppose that any minister of the gospel, whose character, so far as veracity is concerned, is equal to the angels, will ever preach another gospel and palm it off as the truth of Jesus Christ? Such impostors as Jo Smith, Brigham Young, and all the impostors who ever lived in the world, before and after Christ, and those who are living at the present day, and in our midst, never were Christians, even though they preach the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints, or that they fall from grace and are lost. Suppose I state, hypothetically, that when a camel (I do not mean Alexander Campbell) shall go through the eye of a needle, then a rich man may enter into

the kingdom, are we to conclude that a camel ever did go through the eye of a needle? Most assuredly not. Suppose I hypothetically state, that when my opponent changes his skin, or the leopard changes his spots, then may you who are doing wickedly learn to do good, am I to infer that my opponent will ever change his hide, or that the leopard will ever change his spots, unless he leaves one spot and goes to another? [Laughter.]

Now, sirs, look at these facts square and full in the face. My opponent does not take the Bible as brother Helm preached it yesterday. That was one of the most powerful efforts I ever heard against the doctrine of infant purity. I have said my opponent does not preach the gospel just as brother Robinson preached it yesterday, comparing it to a great golden chain, whose staple is fastened in the throne of God. He has not taken one single link of my chain, even to look at it, but I have already taken two links of his, and parted them as a rope of sand.

Now let us come to the case of poor old Judas, the third saint he has canonized—and he is like what Dean Swift said about the Devil:

“The Devil was sick, the Devil a monk would be;
The Devil was well, the devil a monk was he.”

Judas was numbered, it is true, with the apostles whom the Father had given his Son for a specific purpose, that the Scriptures might be

fulfilled. Judas never was a Christian—never was a believer in Jesus Christ. And here my opponent will have persons Christians who are devoid of belief. I know it will puzzle him to produce a change of state in relation to Judas Iscariot, for there is no evidence that he was ever baptized, there is no record of the fact, or that any of the apostles were baptized, save Saul of Tarsus. And here, forsooth, he is going to have a Christian manufactured out of an individual, because it suits his purpose, it agrees with his position; like the Dutchman, who would agree with the court, provided the court would agree with him. He had Judas a Christian, without faith, without being baptized; and now he has to prove these things before he can establish his supposition, that Judas was a saint. He has not shown that Judas had grace from which he had fallen. Now, my dear sirs, do you not see his inconsistency? “O, consistency, thou art a jewel!” It seems to me that he has lost his memory, having forgotten that this saint of his sold his Lord and Master for fifteen dollars in silver. Let me read what the Holy Spirit says, and if you can make out a christian case for Judas, be it so. Don't you observe how convenient this “scrap-book” is for reference? It was arranged by my little wife, who is my amanuensis, and who can write much better than myself. Mathew xxvi. 24:

“The Son of Man goeth as it is written of him, but wo unto that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed.” He had not yet betrayed, and committed the sin which doomed him to perdition in the estimation of my friend; but there was a wo upon him. Talk about a wo being upon a true saint! It is not, Wo unto you saints, but, “Wo unto you Scribes, Pharisees, and hypocrites,” is the language of Christ. “It had been good for that man if he had not been born.” What kind of a character did he sustain in the estimation of my Lord and Master, who knows the hearts of men, and who said, “There are some of you that believe not.” Talk about an unbelieving Christian! You might as well talk to me about a sober drunkard, an honest thief, or a truthful liar, as to talk about a Christian without faith in Jesus Christ. If Jesus knew, from the beginning, who they were that believed not, and who would betray him, would he first make a saint of his betrayer? “Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?”—not a saint, as my friend has said. I will prove him to be a dirty devil before I get through; and then, if my friend wants to associate with such devils, I will not envy his choice. I will rather associate with poor old Peter, a backslider, but who returned to the Lord; and with good old David, whose mother was vilely abused by insinuation on the

part of my opponent. I will show you that he was an unclean devil. John xiii. 11, 18: "For he knew who should betray him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean. I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen: but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me, hath lifted up his heel against me." John xvii. 12: "While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the scripture might be fulfilled." This "son of perdition" is Judas. "And they went out from us, but they were not of us. If they had been of us they would have continued with us, but they went out that they might manifest that they were not of us." What is true of Judas is also true of every apostate. [*Time expired.*]

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 2 o'clock, P. M.

[MR. FRANKLIN'S SECOND ADDRESS.]

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In the good providence of God, it is my fortune to have the privilege of addressing you again. I beg your indulgence a few moments while I review two or three points only, referred

to in my speech, and which occupied so much of the attention of my friend.

The first case to which I shall call your attention is that of Simon—my brother, as he calls him. The gentleman walks out and tells you all that Simon was a hypocrite, that all his belief was pretence. Now, all I have to say about it is, that it rests wholly upon the unsupported assertion of brother Fisher. The word of the living God says that Simon believed, and he (Fisher) comes up here, and denying it, tells this audience that Simon was a hypocrite, when there is no intimation in the Bible but that he believed, and as intensely and truly as any man here. I will give you one evidence that such was the case. I believe that Phillip, being filled with the Holy Ghost, was a preacher, and, to say the least of it, of as much perspicacity as Mr. Fisher. If he had perceived that he was a hypocrite, I do not believe he would have baptized him. But the fact that this minister of Jesus Christ, being full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom, heard him make his confession, and baptized him, was an evidence that, so far as he could perceive, he was a believer. The word of God states that he was a believer, and so long as it does, it is no use for preachers to say otherwise. He was talking the other day about indictments. I suppose, by his bringing in these legal terms, that he has been

initiated into the legal profession. Well, at any rate, he has learned one part of the profession—in making out a case of indictment, to put in it as many charges as possible, hoping that he may possibly sustain some of them. What is the charge against Simon? Peter says, “I perceive thou art in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity;” but my friend comes up and says he perceives he was never converted. I beg his pardon. Peter assigns his reason: “Thou hast thought to purchase the gift of God with money.” And when he tells him to “pray God if perhaps the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee,” he turns to Peter and implores him to pray the Lord that none of these things of which he has spoken may fall upon him.

I was amused at my friend when he undertook to show you how I stood upon Peter’s words on the day of Pentecost, and he tried five times to quote Peter’s words, but did not succeed. Now, whether he was so excited and confused that he could not recollect them, or whether he was so ignorant as not to know what Peter did say, or whether he was unwilling to repeat those words, I pretend not to decide; but he failed, after five trials, to quote the words correctly. I would like to have him recall Peter’s answer to the “mourners.” Mr. Fisher would have said, “Bow down and we

will pray for you." Peter says, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." I can quote it without stammering, because I go with the Bible, and nothing but the Bible. I have no Campbellism, or Baptism, or Presbyterianism to defend; but I say let the word of God speak for itself, and let the world hear and the preachers tremble.

After repeated failures in quoting the apostle's language, he next tries to fix up an issue between us, by telling this audience that he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. But did not Simon believe, was he not baptized, and did he not apostatize? I claim, on the part of Simon, that he was a believer, and that he was baptized. Do you remember what a beautiful sentence my friend uttered about a believer? It was so beautiful that I have not the ability to quote it. I leave the gentleman to manage this case as far as he can. I intend to make him back out from his proposition.

There is another secret he has found out, and I have been at a loss to know where he discovered it. He says Paul was full of the Holy Ghost before he was baptized. Where did he learn that? He did not learn it any where. There is no evidence that Paul had the Holy Ghost at all, until he arose and obeyed

the commandment of God. The Lord told him to go to Damascus and find out what to do. He complied, and found that he must arise and be baptized and wash away his sins; and after baptism he obtained possession of the gift. My opponent made fifteen ineffectual attempts to quote what Paul did not say. Paul did not say one word about baptism to the Church at Ephesus. Instead of using the Bible, he has brought up here a hymn book, and among other documents a scrap-book, which he calls his family Testament! Do the teachings of the tract published by the Tract Society, the Christian hymn book, and the quotations from Mr. Campbell, teach that saints can not fall from grace? What have these tracts to do with the proposition which says, Do the *Scriptures* teach, &c.? The principal arguments upon which I rely he graciously passes by.

I now call his attention to Ezekiel. How has he fixed up that passage about the righteous man turning away from his righteousness? He says it means self-righteousness. Well, this is the first time I ever heard of a man turning away from his self-righteousness. God says, he that turneth away from his righteousness shall surely die. Now, Mr. Fisher would have it, that a man should be punished for turning away from self-righteousness, and, on the other hand, should be rewarded for persisting in it!

God declares, if a man turns away from his righteousness (not self-righteousness), he shall die; and if he continues steadfast in his righteousness (not self-righteousness), he shall live.

Well, what shall we do with poor old Judas Iscariot? My friend labored the case of Judas long and loud, and he thinks he made out that Judas was a sinner from the beginning, and made a considerable triumph over it: and when, he asked, was Judas baptized for the remission of sins? I just informed the gentleman that the institution of baptism for the remission of sins was not instituted until the day of Pentecost, before which Judas nor any other person had entered into the Church in this world. I would like for him to look into the case of Judas, and see if he can find one single passage corroborative of the false position he has assumed in regard to this man, and also see if he was not as good a Christian as any of them, up to a certain period. "Why," says he. "Judas was not a believer!" Did not John say, in the strongest terms, in the 17th chapter of his epistle, that he had kept them through the name of him who gave them to him? In John xiii. you see where the Devil entered into him. The Devil was not in him before that. No, sir: Satan could not have entered into him if he had been a devil from the beginning. Jesus kept him until the Devil entered into him,

when he was declared an unbeliever, and fell from grace and was lost.

I have paid about as much attention to his last speech as it demands. What attention did he give to the arguments I used upon Peter's injunction—"Add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge," &c.? He took good care to forget that passage, as also the 5th of Gallatians. To Hebrews 6th, where it speaks of those who were made partakers of the Holy Spirit. and to the latter part of Revelations, where some are threatened with having their names taken from the Book of Life, he says not a word in reply, but he had rather compare me to Judas and Simon. He deals more in language of that kind than in the words of Scripture. What reply did he make to the second chapter of Hebrews? It is not in the power of a living man to reply to it. The question with us is not, whether men or angels do fall, but the proposition says, can they fall? Is it in the power of an angel to fall? The apostle says they have fallen, and warns man of the danger he is in—admonishes him to be on his guard and maintain a strict watch over himself, lest he, too, may have his name taken from the Book of Life. The gentleman does not pay any regard to my arguments, but I will keep them thundering upon his ears until he is compelled, ignominiously, to retreat. When

God exhorts men not to forsake the truth, when he admonishes them to be vigilant and resist temptations, it is not for man to endeavor to persuade his fellow-creatures that they are infallible, that it is impossible for them to sin, and they need entertain no apprehension of danger, and should fold their hands and assure themselves of their certain security. "If any man teach any other doctrine than this, let him be accursed. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FISHER'S SECOND REPLY.]

Brethren Moderators:

Upon our first interview, I noticed that my learned opponent's nerves were subject to considerable febrile action, and subsequently perceived the premonitory symptoms of what is technically termed *phrenitis* by the medical faculty; and I now regret to state, that, judging from the indications which usually manifest themselves in such cases, viz., flushed countenance, wild and incoherent expressions, &c., that he is actually afflicted with the afore-mentioned malady. And I would respectfully suggest, that as he deems water a universal panacea for moral ills, he be induced to try its efficacy in a physical direction.

I will make one remark in answer to a misrepresentation. Did he not charge me with having wilfully misquoted Acts iii. 38? I believe that is about the only passage he can quote from memory, and upon that his system is founded. I will forfeit my reputation as a Christian, as a gentleman, and a man of common sense, if that quotation is not found in the manuscript of the reporter.

You remember that when he took up the case of the first saint he canonized, he was very careful to tell us that Simon was a believer, and that he was baptized; and was also particularly careful to keep back the fact that Simon was not in the possession of the Holy Spirit. He also canonized Judas. I will just quote the words of Jesus in relation to this man (John vi. 64): "For there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him." And again he said: "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" Now, Jesus knew he was an unbeliever and a devil, from the beginning. My opponent can not draw me aside, as he has heretofore done, on outside issues. This is his tact and forte, in this his strength lies; but I will not follow him. Does he suppose that I am going to pay attention to every pas-

sage he quotes, however unimportant it may be? If he does, he is deceived.

Let me first pay attention to what he said about Saul. He stated that I said Saul was full of the Holy Ghost. Now, I will demonstrate the truth of what I said. Acts ix. 17: "And Annias went his way, and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him, said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared to thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost." If he was *filled* with the Holy Spirit, was he not *full* of the Holy Spirit? Any other construction of the passage, as every one can see, is sheer quibbling. In Hebrews vi., the Apostle says, "those that were once enlightened, . . . if they should fall away." O, that mighty *if!* "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, *if* they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." In verse 9, Paul says: "But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak." Now, what do you say to that?

I am very sorry to see my opponent in such a bad humor this evening. He wants to know why I did not pay attention to old father Adam. I certainly respect my primogenial ancestor. Adam was placed in a covenant of works, and there was nothing under the heavens to secure him from falling but his obedience. He had not a single promise—no security—his implicit obedience was all. Instead of obeying God, he served the devil, and he fell, and brought death into the world. The question is not about Adam's having fallen, or the angels having apostatized, but it is whether *saints* can apostatize and fall from grace. "Adam fell—why may not we fall?" is the logic of my opponent. Enoch was translated—why not we be translated? Elijah went to heaven in a blazing chariot, drawn by steeds of fire—why may not we go up in the same way? This, my hearers, is a mere *petitio principii*. My friend is very expert in the art of dodging.

Now, my beloved hearers, let us hear something in relation to the promise of God to those who are in the covenant of grace, made with the Father and the Son. Job says, in xviii. 19: "The righteous shall also hold on his way; and he that hath clean hands shall be stronger and stronger." Psalm xxxvii. 23, 24: "The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord,

and he delighteth in his way. Though he fall, he shall not utterly be cast down, for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand." What will he do with this? Will he set aside the testimony of Job and of David? Let us read another passage from the lips of the beloved apostle, and hear what he says to those who are in the covenant of grace: "Who have been kept by the power of God, through faith, unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time." Here is some indemnification against their falling. My opponent has brought forward some other passages which are irrelevant, and which do not deserve notice; but I will now give him a few verses that belong to the same category, and will show from these facts, that the saints will persevere through grace to glory.

Isaiah says, (liii. 11:) "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied." Here is a promise of the Father to his Son—a solemn covenant entered into upon the part of the Father with his Son—that these individuals shall remain in the covenant of grace. Suppose his seed is lost which the God of heaven promised him, then will he ever see the travail of his soul and be satisfied? What becomes of the promise of Almighty God to man? John x. 27-29: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me. And I give unto them eternal life; and they

shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them to me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." Now, when the devil can pluck us out of the hand of God, I have no doubt but we shall be sentenced to that lake of fire and brimstone, whose smoke ascendeth for ever. But the blessed Jesus tells us, that there are none able to do this. John vi. 37: "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me, and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." The devil can not get them—the Father will not cast them from him, and they can not fall. John xvii. 2: "As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him;" vi. 39: "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." Now, what do you think of this plain and positive declaration of the Bible in opposition to some of the hypothetical cases my opponent has brought forward, and in relation to a sorcerer and a hypocrite? If these promises of the covenant of redemption fail, then there is no security whatever for my opponent and your unworthy servant. In the covenant of grace, Jesus is our surety, and will keep us until death; for I

am persuaded that he is able to do it. Now, if we are to be kept by our own acts and works, there is no hope whatever, my beloved hearers, for our attainment of salvation. From the kind of grace my opponent has been preaching during this controversy, we may fall, like the person he was talking about, who fell from that which he did not possess. My opponent is certainly logician enough to know that the same power that makes, or creates, it takes to unmake or uncreate. He has told us, time and again, that, in the first place, there is a divine change of heart; in the second place, a change of character; and, in the third place, a change of state. Well now, if a man is in the kingdom, and his state is changed, who brings about this change? If I change the State of Kentucky for that of Indiana, who effects the change? If an individual changes the state of Christianity for that of sin—the kingdom of grace for the kingdom of Satan, and he was baptized into that state or kingdom where his state was changed, must he not be baptized *out* again? Is not this case as plain as the nose on a man's face? He brought forward the kingdom of Jesus Christ as being composed of little children, born into the kingdom by the birth of nature. Now, Mr. Campbell says: "There are three kingdoms: the kingdom of nature, the kingdom of grace, and the kingdom

of ultimate glory. We enter the kingdom of nature by being born of the flesh—‘that which is born of the flesh is flesh;’ we enter the kingdom of grace by being born again.” But my opponent would have us born into the kingdom of nature and the kingdom of grace at the same time. Then it should read, “and of such flesh is the kingdom of heaven composed!!” Now, what do you think of such logic as that? It happens most egregiously (and this is where my opponent has fallen from grace) that all the little ones who do not die in infancy fall out of this kingdom; and they must have a divine change of heart, and a divine change of character, and a change of state, to get back into the kingdom from whence they fell—literally backwards! I ask, in the name of common sense, if my opponent’s doctrine is true, if baptism initiates persons into the kingdom and they fall out, by what other initiating act will he get them back again? Will he not have to re-baptize them, and again have to go over the same routine to effect his divine changes? He had better adopt the plan I suggested, of having a great hospital in the world, and angels sent to nurse the little ones, and their fathers and mothers taken to heaven, while the children, as a matter of course, would grow up pure and undepraved, according to his doctrine; the devil would not annoy us,

and we would not have to leave our homes, preach our lives out, and get nothing but curses and persecution for it. Every person can see the folly and absurdity of his propositions: to name them is to refute them. But I am not done with these promises; God bless you, the Bible is full of them. Listen to 2 Thessalonians iii. 3, 4. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FRANKLIN'S THIRD ADDRESS.]

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Notwithstanding the gentleman's fears, it is again my good fortune to appear before you. I shall make but one remark in relation to Simon. The gentleman states that his objection to Simon is not that he is a hypocrite, but that he did not have the Holy Ghost. All I have to say in regard to this is, that we have the same evidence that he had it in his possession, as that Peter or John were possessed of it. I will make a single reference to Paul being filled with the Holy Ghost. The gentleman was so much excited respecting this, that he did not see the point, or seeing it, did not want you to see it. The statement I made, was, that there was not one scrap of evidence about his being filled with the Holy Ghost.

before he was baptized. He quotes Annias; and if I could only quote Scripture like he can, or had a wife to write it in a hand as beautiful as his does, what a fortune it would be! I will risk it. Annias said before Saul: "The Lord, even Jesus, whom you saw in the way as you came here, has sent me to you that you may be filled with the Holy Ghost and receive your sight." Now, to prove that he was not possessed of the Spirit, Annias says: "Why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

I believe I must refer to these sheep spoken of in John x. One would think to hear him talk, that these sheep could never be caught; there is no danger of wolves catching them; there is no death for them. I would not pay preachers for watching a flock and trying to save them, if they could not die. It is all absolute absurdity, and puts me in mind of a gentleman of Warsaw who had got into Universalism. I asked him why they hired preachers to attend to them if all were to be saved. In the same way I reply to my friend: If the saints can never fall, why employ and pay a man to watch them? If the sheep can not stray, where is the use of a shepherd? If I believed as he pretends to, I would take hold of the plow-handles and *earn* a living like the

rest of the people. The Lord says: "The thief cometh in the night to slay, to kill, and to destroy; I have come that they may live. I am the good shepherd that giveth his life for his sheep." Now, these sheep could be caught; there was danger; and, consequently, he charges the shepherds most solemnly to take charge of the sheep, that they be not scattered. My friend declares that they can never fall—there is no danger; and, in trying to prove it, he quotes several passages about the promises of God, every one of which is based upon the condition that you hear the voice of the Shepherd, that you obey and honor him. "Ye are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation;" but the condition is that you continue in the faith. As John expresses it: "If you continue in the Son and Father, and the government of God, he will never leave you, but will grant you glory." The expression, I am able to hold you up, is intended to encourage the obedience of the pious and holy man, who, if he makes a proper effort to serve and honor his God, no power can pluck him out of God's hands. I contend that no power can pluck the saints out of the hands of God as long as they love, honor, and obey him. But the proposition is not, whether they will be plucked out; it is, whether or not they can fall from grace—can they turn away from God—

can they fall through an evil heart of unbelief. I have proved that they can. He gets up here, turns around and says: "Do you think I am going over all those passages? I did not say so at the beginning." [A laugh.] He can see no necessity for all the exhortations and expostulations in the Bible about being faithful unto death, and does not think the saints ought to be admonished, lest a promise being left of entering into rest, some of them should come short.

He got tired before he went through his last speech, on the question that the saints can not fall from grace; and he tried total hereditary depravity again, and undertook to explain to me his very wisely contrived hospital, which is to be guarded by angels, like his blessed little residence among flowers. He is going to have an hospital of this kind erected, and have the children put in and kept from sin; and in this way he intends to get rid of all the sinners. If his doctrine had been true, that depravity descends from the mother, what good could result from such seclusion as he proposes, when the seeds of sin are there? The man who declares the doctrine of total hereditary depravity and corruption, throws the charge of infamy on the mother. I do not believe a syllable of it. The wickedness is not from our mothers, it is from our own evil practices—it

is in our being estranged from God. While he is on total depravity, I must remind him of another passage. He told us that the Lord took upon him our nature—the Saviour did so. Well, I believe that the Lord took upon him our nature. What does he say our nature is? Why, total hereditary depravity! Well, *the Lord took upon him total hereditary depravity.* Now, sir, I deny that the Lord took sin upon him; for the Scriptures say he was without sin.

I want to begin where my time ran out. “Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering (for he is faithful that promised); and let us consider one another, to provoke unto love, and to do good works: not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another, and so much the more as ye see the day approaching. For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins; but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.” Heb. x. 22–27. Here is one having the holy profession, who says, if he sins wilfully, there is no more sacri-

fice for sin; but Brother Fisher says that the saints can not sin wilfully. This seals condemnation upon his doctrine, to which he says, *amen*. I hope he will quit preaching such unreasonable doctrines. "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord: looking diligently, lest any man fail of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby many be defiled; lest there be any fornicator or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birth-right. For ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected; for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears." Heb. xii. 14-17. Esau would have inherited the blessing but he rejected it wilfully, and if we fall from the grace of God, if we turn away from his commandments, we may, like Judas, pray in vain. Judas, after he had fallen, was filled with grief, and came back with the pieces of money and threw them down. "What is the matter, Judas; were you never among the disciples of Jesus?" "Yes; but the Devil entered into my heart: I betrayed the innocent blood of my Master for fifteen dollars." He came back to seek repentance, but not to find it; and he went away in his desperation and hung himself. This is a good example of turning away from the holy commandments.

Judas sold his birth-right for thirty pieces of silver—he sought it again, but in vain; and Jesus said it would have been better for him had he never been born, than after he was born, to turn away from the holy commandments.

In Revelations iii. it is said: “He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels.” Christ knew they could fall, and, consequently, exhorted them, and sent a holy man of God to expostulate and reason with them. Hear his encouragement in the verse last quoted. The antithesis is, that if he does not obey he shall not be clothed in white raiment—his name shall be blotted out of the book of life. He that overcometh, I will confess his name before my Father, and before his angels; he that does not overcome, I will not confess. See the conclusion of the same chapter: “To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne.” Here is encouragement to persevere. But what respect does he pay to these passages? “And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this

book." Rev. xxii. 19. If none but saints had a part in the book of life, I ask, what is the meaning of this? If a saint can not fall from grace, there is no meaning in it. My friend says he has fastened a harpoon in me. If he has, I never saw it. But I have fastened one in him, and he had better turn around and preach the truth as Paul did, and exhort his brethren to be vigilant, lest any one of them fall from the grace of God and be lost. Would it not be infinitely better to do this than to be always telling them, "You are invulnerable; you can not fall from grace."

I wonder if it would be in order for me to make some references to the Baptist churches throughout the country, and demonstrate that some of them can fall from grace. Were I at liberty to discuss the amicable relations that exist between me and the good brother, I could find some pretty good evidences that it is at least *possible* for saints to fall from grace. But I confess I take no pleasure in reverting to matters of this kind, and I would not desire to produce any unpleasantness by so doing. However, I will give one illustration. Thirty years ago, statistics reported fifteen thousand Baptists in the State of Kentucky. We have risen till we now number over sixty thousand, while the Baptist preachers have been trying to beat us down, but I think in about five years more, if

we have good luck, we will be in advance of the old Baptist Church in the State of Kentucky. Now, sir, we are not going down, and God Almighty knows we have no intention of going down. We do not believe in falling from grace. It is one of those loathsome, unpalatable truths humanity has to acknowledge, that man *can* fall, and he ought to come down to the throne of grace and implore God to strengthen him. It may be that this is the reason the Baptists have not got along better. I am afraid my brother has been preaching to them to get faith, while they have lost grace; having assured them of their security they have neglected prayer and works. But instead of doing this, he should, like the Apostle Paul, be constantly exhorting them to persevere, admonishing them to be vigilant and not to let the word of God slip; warning them of the dangers by which their paths are beset; expostulating with them on the necessity of a strict watch over all their actions; exhorting them to add to their faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity. But what does my friend say to this passage? He sums it up among those other passages which he says he is not going to pay any attention to. But, sir, he can not examine it; that is, he can not reply to the arguments based upon that

passage, because it is not in his power to do so. The apostle did not believe his doctrine, and, consequently, told believers that if they would turn away from the holy command, they had better not have known the word of God. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FISHER'S THIRD REPLY.]

Brethren Moderators:

While my opponent observed that he did not see the harpoon, he manifested by his words and actions that he felt it, and that it was any thing but pleasant, too. I was sorry to see the display and expenditure upon his part of so much ingenuity in relation to Paul's conversion, and I am sure that should I make such an attempt, with this book before me, death would be my penalty. I leave it to any man who has as much brains as can be colonized on the point of a fine cambric needle, if Paul's baptism was not the last thing of the series. The passage, "that thou mightest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost," shows conclusively, that the Holy Spirit followed immediately the reception of his sight. But my opponent, instead of quoting a connected passage to substantiate his

assertions, turns around to speak of my blessed Saviour having taken upon himself our nature of sin! I wonder he did not tell this audience that sin was a part of our nature. I will pay no attention to such outside issues, but will content myself with presenting to you the law and the testimony which relate directly to this subject. As to all the warning he has been talking about, I wonder if I too do not warn them as faithfully, and exhort them as repeatedly, as he does. In regard to the conditions, as certain as God has promised the reward, so certain will the promises be complied with. "For the Lord loveth judgment, and forsaketh not his saints; they are preserved for ever." Psalms xxxvii. 28. Again, in 2 Thessalonians iii. 3, 4: "But the Lord is faithful, who shall establish you, and keep you from evil. And we have confidence in the Lord touching you, that ye both do and will do the things which we command you." Is it not plain that the conditions will be complied with, as certain as that the promise has been given? Isaiah: "And they shall be my people, and I will be their God; and will give unto them one heart and one way that they may fear me for ever." Psalm lxxxiv.: "They go from strength to strength; every one of them in Zion appeareth before God." Proverbs x. 29, 30: "The way of the Lord is strength to the upright;

but destruction shall be to the workers of iniquity. The righteous shall never be removed; but the wicked shall not inhabit the earth." "The path of the just is as a shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." Proverbs iv. 18. Isaiah xlix. 15: "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget; yet will I not forget thee." Now, let us hear what God says in the New Testament, and if my opponent has to quarrel with this doctrine, let him level his artillery at this book, and its blessed Author, and not at me, and the Church of which I am but an humble representative. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." "And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." "But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever, and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." John v. 24, xi. 26, iv. 14, vi. 51.

What will my friend do with these positive declarations from the lips of Almighty God? "Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish." If my opponent knew the true import of this, he would see that the kingdom of heaven is composed of these little ones; for if it is composed of the little children that were set in the midst, then it is not made up of persons baptized into it for the remission of their sins! Any body can see this. Rom. vi. 14: "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." Now, the man who sins, expecting to be justified by the law, I say, has fallen from grace. What saith the law: "The man that does not continue in all things written in the book of the law to do them, shall be accursed." Where is the man who lives or ever did live, that has kept the whole law to the very spirit and letter? Luke x. 42: "But one thing is needful; and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her." Romans viii. 29, 30: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate, to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also

glorified." Was Judas glorified? Was Simon Magus glorified? Judas was never justified, for he was lost. He was one of those chosen ones, but God foreknew he was a devil from the beginning. Ephesians i. 13, 14: "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise. Which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." When Saul believed in Jesus of Nazareth, he was sealed with the promise; and the seal is affixed to every believer until the last day. Hebrews vi. 17, 19: "Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath. Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil." Let the waves dash and the billows surge, the vessel can never perish until the Pilot is lost. Through every storm he has given us this hope which is both sure and steadfast. Is it not a principle in human law, that if the legitimate heir's title to an inheritance is valid, that the joint heirs' title is just as good? We are joint heirs with the Lord Jesus Christ, and if Jesus Christ has a good title to a throne and crown of glory in

heaven, his saints' title is just as good as his! Pick a flaw in the title of Jesus Christ to a burning throne, a pavilion of light and glory, a sceptre and inheritance in heaven, and then, sir, you can pick a flaw in the title of the joint heirs, which is incorruptible, undefiled, and which fadeth not away!

In conclusion, I must be permitted, my beloved brethren, to give an illustration of the sentiments of A. Campbell, Barton W. Stone, Walter Scott, and John T. Johnson, contained in two beautiful verses. No man who knew the latter person would dare say he was not a good man. He was upright, talented, energetic—a man of character, and a burning light in the Christian world; and I will here inform my opponent that this great man was from the bosom of the Baptist Church in this State, was baptized upon a profession of his faith, but if ever for the remission of his sins, I know it not. This book from which I read, was printed for the disciples; and if this is not true, it is as wrong to sing a lie, or to print a lie, as it is to tell a lie:

'Twixt Jesus and the chosen race
Subsists a bond of sov'reign grace,
That hell, with its infernal train,
Shall ne'er dissolve or rend in twain.

This sacred tie forbids their fears,
For all he is, or has, is theirs;
With him, their head, they stand or fall,
Their life, their surety, and their all.

But the throne of Jesus will never become a solitude, nor the inheritance of the saints of God abandoned to desolation. Never, sir, never! I do not bring forward this allegory from Bunyan, as proof, but as a beautiful illustration of the doctrine for which I contend. He, Bunyan, represents Christian as holding on to the skirts of Christ, while Satan, the great tempter, comes up to Christian and says: "I will cut your fingers off, and you will drop into hell!" He meekly replies: "The arms of Christ are around me; cut *his* fingers off you can not." Sirs, there is a union between the believer and Jesus; a union between God and his Son, a covenant not only between the Father and the Son, but between the believer and Jesus, which is just as certain to be kept as God is upon his throne. Let my opponent, with all his tact, with all his talent, all his acumen, and all his chicanery—let him, if he can, overturn these evidences I have presented from God's book.

[MR. FRANKLIN'S FOURTH ADDRESS.]

Beloved Hearers:

We have assembled, as now contemplated, to close our present discussion; and when we come towards the close of an investigation of this kind, where there has been some excitement, some little personalities, and aspersions, I think it is well to try and make amends, as far as we can, for all that is wrong; endeavor to create as good a state of feeling as possible, and fix our minds upon the issues at discussion, and be careful of our language, as we have one day to answer to God, who will determine who is right and who is wrong. I told you in the commencement of this controversy, that if I knew my heart, I had no desire to gain a victory over a fellow mortal, nor a victory over any religious party. All this I still feel, and if I can gain a victory for truth, a conquest over error, and be instrumental under God in enlightening my fellow creatures, nothing will afford me a higher happiness. With these very brief preliminary observations, I shall proceed to state anew the issues before us, and to enter into the merits of the discussion as rapidly as I can.

Our question is not, how many will fall from grace, or who will fall, but the whole contro-

versy hangs on this language: "Can the saints or children of God, by any possibility, apostatize or fall from grace?" I claim that they can, have stated so in the affirmative, and have been endeavoring to prove this proposition which my friend denies. In all honorable controversy it is the duty of the respondent to answer, or at least attempt to reply to the arguments of the affirmant, before he is at liberty to bring forward any new arguments of his own. In case he does not confine himself strictly to the issues under consideration, and before answering the arguments of his opponent, brings in new and irrelevant matter, he reverses the natural order of debate, and makes the affirmant his own respondent. I mention this in the outset of my investigations, on account of the fact that the gentleman not only did not follow me and reply to my arguments, but openly and roundly declared that he *would not do it!* Now, if it were desirable, a few strict rules of the controversy might be enforced, and the gentleman be compelled to examine at least a few of my principal arguments in the affirmative, and not waste his time in introducing new classes of arguments. Bro. Fisher has introduced quite a number of proof-texts in favor of his doctrine, and it seems to me as if both these doctrines are proved in the affirmative—that one says a thing is so, and another

that it is not so. There can be no argument to prove a thing is so, and is not so, at the same time. If my friend brings one scriptural passage to prove that his doctrine is true, I can not bring one forward to prove the truth of mine. There is not a passage in the Bible that conflicts with another passage; and if I introduce a passage which he does not set aside, it is clear to every person here that I am right.

But I feel bound for a little more in this controversy than merely to reply to brother Fisher. I feel that there are obligations of a still higher character than these. There are, I am aware, gentlemen listening here who are not members of any Church, and whom we would not see sink into the degradation of infidelity, and whom we would not let believe that the Bible runs counter to its own statements. Shall we hold up the Bible as proving and disproving precisely the same propositions? Is there no means by which these passages can be harmonized, and all shown to be true? A Christian man has a right to cherish the whole, and there is not a passage which my friend has quoted that is not as dear to me as any passage I have quoted. I would not have that passage which declares, "He shall give unto them eternal life," nor the one which says, "He is able to keep them from falling"—

I would not have one of these passages stricken out of the Bible, for every man of God has use for them; for they encourage and comfort him. But shall we encourage the child of God by proving that other passages are not true? I find in one place where Paul says, we are justified by faith. That makes faith the condition of justification, and no matter if I find an hundred other passages in the Bible where other conditions are demanded, I still say there is no justification in any case without faith. There is a passage in Scripture where God declares concerning Nineveh, that he would destroy it, but there is nothing about the condition. You find, in the history of that city, that the appointed time passed by, and God did not destroy it; but are we to declare the word of God failed here—are we to come forward and infer that the word of God was not true? If there had not been a comment upon that in the New Testament, no man could have known that a condition was implied in that case. He declares that Nineveh heard the preaching of Jonah and repented, and upon this condition destruction did not come upon them. Here is another case. God made a promise to the Israelites that they should enter into Canaan; but how reads the history of these people? You find that three and twenty thousand fell in the wilderness, and of the sixty thousand,

only two—Caleb and Joshua—passed into the promised land. There is not a word about a condition in the whole passage; but shall we declare that the promise of God failed? It did not fail, but the people failed to comply with the condition which they understood, and which was, that they should not depart from the living God. And Paul, commenting upon the case, says, it originated from an evil heart of unbelief. Here, then, is the condition with which they did not comply, and God makes them an example for us to look upon and fear, lest a promise being given we should come short of it. I will now call your attention to one or two passages in 2 Chronicles xv. 2: “And he went out to meet Asa, and said unto him, Hear ye me, Asa, and all Judah and Benjamin: the Lord is with you, while ye be with him; and if ye seek him, he will be found of you; but if ye forsake him, he will forsake you.” Now, this is the condition implied in every one of the passages, and there is not a man living who can make the Bible contradict itself. When God says, I will never forsake you, it is on the condition that you never forsake him. When he says, I am able to hold you up, it is implied that ye “obey my voice and harden not your hearts.” On these conditions nothing is able to effect a separation between you and the love of Jesus Christ. But

I want to call your attention to another passage in Jeremiah xviii.: "The word which came to Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, Arise, and go down to the potter's house, and there I will cause thee to hear my words. Then I went down to the potter's house; and, behold, he wrought a work on the wheels. And the vessel he made of clay was marred in the hand of the potter; so he made it again another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it. Then the word of the Lord came to me, saying, O house of Israel, can not I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in my hand, O house of Israel." Now I want to show you, that God in speaking of these promises, kept constantly in his mind certain conditions which were to be complied with. "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and destroy it: if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them." Do you not discover how the condition is employed? Hear God

when he speaks against a nation, which, if it hears and obeys his voice, he will avert the evil from it, and if it disobeys he will make them vessels of dishonor. 2 Timothy ii. 21: "If a man, therefore, purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified, and meet for the Master's use, and prepared unto every good work." Thus, you see, all these glorious promises are based upon the contingency that you keep his commandments and hearken unto his voice. So long as you do this, every promise quoted by my friend stands fast; but the very moment you disobey the voice of God, you forfeit all these guarantees and sink your soul into ruin. That you have the power to refuse to hear his voice, and make yourselves vessels of dishonor, is as evident as that you are a fallible human being. In place of my friend being here battling against me, he should stand by my side and try to enable the child of God to persevere, be faithful unto the end, to overcome all, and ultimately to gain a crown of life. I believe I will make a brief reference to Ezekiel xxxiii. 14, in relation to the conditional points of this promise: "Again, when I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right; if the wicked restore the pledge, give again that he had robbed, walk in the statutes of life, without

committing iniquity, he shall surely live, he shall not die: none of his sins that he hath committed shall be mentioned unto him; he hath done that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live." Here you discover that the condition is inserted, and wherever God speaks of a sinner, that condition is implied; he must turn from his wickedness, and no sinner can come to God without so doing. No promise in the word of God is binding. He can furnish no comfort to one disciple—not a solitary one. Do you remember how my friend hastened away from the above-mentioned chapter, which he quoted from the family Bible his good lady made for him? He read it over with a good deal of confidence, and took the position that the righteous turning away from his righteousness was from his self-righteousness. Strange that God should threaten a man for turning away from his self-righteousness, by saying he shall surely die; and, on the other hand, that if he turns away from his sin, he shall surely live! My friend reminds me of a little boy who got a drawer open; a razor was in there, and he let go of it, cut his finger, and he did not want to handle razors any more. Just so with my friend, who got hold of a passage which he found it was not safe to handle; and he turns around and says: "You need'nt think I am going to follow you." I wonder what his

position is? If he does not intend to follow after me, I should like to know his office. But still I don't want to require of him what he can not do. "If I am in error," says he, "I intend to live in that error and to die in it." I hope he will take that word back. As for me, no matter how dear to my heart my most cherished opinion may be, just only convince me of its error, and I will unhesitatingly spew it out of my mouth. What! live in an error when Jesus is the truth, and the truth makes man free? Convince me of the truth of his doctrine, and I will go and join the Baptist Church; I will get down on my knees at the "mourners bench," and get Brother Fisher to pray for me. As God is my judge, I will do it. I will implore Heaven to be merciful to me for every thing I have said against the Baptists. But the only reason I will not enter the door of this Church is, because it is not true; because he has not shown one word of God to induce me to go there. God knows I desire the truth, and I have no prejudice against the Baptist ministers or against my Baptist brethren. No, gentlemen, as God is my judge, and can this night see me, I am for the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

I want to notice another passage in proof of my position. John xv.: "I am the true vine,

and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away; and every branch that beareth fruit he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch can not bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me." Every one of these passages which my friend quoted, contained the condition that you *abide* in the vine in order to receive the promise. They are universally hypothecated upon your abiding in the truth. "I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." What is the hypothesis here; what is the contingency? If a man abide not in me, if he depart from me, he is to be cast forth as a rotten branch and be burned! [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FISHER'S FOURTH REPLY.]

Brethren Moderators:

I was happy to learn that my opponent was willing to come with us Baptists. It is a clear admission on his part that we have at least truth enough to save *him*; but I say, as a representative of the Baptist Church, that we are not willing to go with him, for we are not agreed; and "how can two walk together except they be agreed?" He is in a most egregious error, therefore I can not go with him. My opponent has in one or two instances misrepresented me, but I will let it pass for the present. They are only side issues, and, as such, I can not notice them.

He spoke of conditions and promises. Upon that, he and I particularly agree. Just as certain as God has promised the saints that if they do thus and so, they shall be saved, just so certain will he perform those obligations. I must pay some little respect to one passage my friend quoted. 2 Peter ii. 20-22: "For if, after they have escaped the pollutions of the world, through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the

way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it has happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." Presupposing that my opponent is sufficiently conversant with natural history to be able to distinguish a dog from a sow, I would ask him respectfully, if the dog spoken of in the proverb was not a dog before he cast his vomit? Was he not a dog after he had cast his vomit? Was he not still a dog, and a very dirty dog, when he returned to his vomit? Again, was not the sow a sow before she was washed? Was she not a sow after she was washed? And was she not the same sow when she returned to her wallowing in the mire? Is it not strange, passing strange, that a man of the professed ability of my opponent, should bring in a dirty dog and a filthy sow in a vain endeavor to prove that the saints of God can fall from grace! Thus have I, with the two-edged sword of truth, swept away the four main pillars which support the temple of my opponent's error. The first pillar was a base hypocrite; the second was the Iscariot traitor; the third was a dog; and the fourth, a dirty sow! [Cheers.] And if my opponent wishes to have a Church composed of hypocrites,

traitors, dogs, and sows, I, for one, will not envy him in his unnatural selection.

I will now turn to a passage which overturns every thing my opponent has said, or can say, in relation to, or defence of, his position. Luke xi. 21, 22: "When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace: but when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armor wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils." This is a figurative expression: the strong man being the Devil, the stronger man is the Lord Jesus Christ; while, by the palace, is meant the human soul; the goods are the affections. Now, if the strong man enters into the palace, and overcoming the stronger man, robs him of his goods, must he not be more powerful than the stronger man, who is the Lord himself? If the Devil can wrest Jesus Christ from the throne of the Christian's affections, he can wrest him from the throne of the universe, and for us there is no security whatever. If he ever gets possession of man's soul he will have to become stronger than God Almighty, and may yet hope to plant his standard before the throne of the Creator, grasp the sceptre, and without shame wear the diadem of universal empire! My opponent admits that he can do it. Let us hear Paul's security in Philippians i. 6: "Being confident of this very

thing, that he which hath began a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." Who has made this promise? Is not God unchangeable? Will he not perform the good work? Paul again says: "I know in whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." If Jesus Christ is not able to keep the saints of the living God, who is able? I would not trust my soul into the hands of the Pope of Rome—that frail, peaceable old dotard; I would not trust it in the keeping of man, nor even the angels on high; but I will commit it to the hands of Jesus Christ, for he alone has given me assurance of its safety in his possession. In Romans viii. 35, 38, 39: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come; nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." In 1 Cor. xiii. 8, 13: "Charity never faileth; but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away." "And now abideth faith,

hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." There is one thing in this passage we agree upon, which is, that the word *charity* ought to have been translated *love*. Now, Judas failed of the greatest of these three, which is love. And where is the promise of Jesus Christ? Will he make himself an egregious liar? Will he tarnish the lustre of his glorious crown by failing to fulfill a promise? Hell would become so deep and wide as to embosom the entire millions of mankind before he would make a useless promise. Hear what Paul says in 2 Timothy iv. 7, 8: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." Such was his confidence after the last battle was fought, the last tear was shed, the last stripe was laid upon his back, he walked out to martyrdom and saw the triumphal chariot of God descend from heaven to bear his sainted spirit to a mansion of bliss—a throne of glory. Look, my beloved hearers, at the case of the Church, in Ephesians v. 25–27: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the

word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." Now, sirs, if my opponent's position is true, he will make the Church of Christ one of the most deformed bodies in God's universe. It will be represented as wrinkled, with the loss of an arm, an eye, a foot, or some other member; as unchaste, as having thrown away her virtue and gone after the Devil, the father of lies. What! a holy Church throw away her virtue, become unclean in any of her parts, a prostitute to the enemy of souls? Never, sir, never! such thoughts are profane. Listen again to the proofs of security contained in Matthew xvi. 13-18: "When Jesus came into the coasts of Cesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am? And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build

my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." My opponent asserts that it can prevail against a few. Well, if against a few, can it not prevail against the whole; and if so, what becomes of the Divine promise? Turn, if you please, to Matthew vii. 21-23: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then I will profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity." I presume that Judas and Simon, and these greedy dogs, and these washed sows, together with every hypocritical villain that ever entered the Church of Jesus Christ, will not be known in that day. If Judas was a true disciple, and these dogs that vomited, and these sows that returned to their wallowing in the mire, were all saints of Jesus Christ, would it be true upon the part of the quick and dead to say, "I never knew you?" But they never were his disciples, he never acknowledged them as such, and, therefore, he says: "Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity, I never knew you." What is true of one apostate, is true of all; and in the light of the fires of judgment,

kindled by the anger of God, their hypocrisy will be made manifest, and in his vengeance he will exclaim, "I never knew you!" Take, if you please, the case of Job. God gave the Devil permission to tempt Job in every shape, in every form and manner. Was there ever, since the creation of man, one who underwent such searching trials as did this servant of God, who says he was an upright man? The Devil put forth his hand and turned a scene of peace and happiness into one of misery and desolation. Walking over the verdant hills and lovely valleys of this man's wide domains, ruin followed his footsteps, and upon the seared hills and parched meadows Job's herds of cattle and flocks of sheep, rotting, poisoned with noxious vapors the very air he breathed. Then, crossing his threshold, he smote with death, in the midst of their festivities, those dearest to the old man's heart. Not content with this, the insatiate tempter breathed upon him, and he became a walking ulcer; and his wife, the confidant of his youth, the companion of his manhood, the bosom friend of his old age, called upon him to curse God and die; while those friends who had flocked around him in the days of his prosperity, now pointed at him the finger scorn and called him a base hypocrite. But, says Job, "Though thou slay me, yet will I trust in thee."

“To them his heart, his love, his griefs were given,
 But all his serious thoughts had rest in heaven.
 As some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
 Swells from the vale, and midway leaves the storm;
 Though round its base the rolling clouds are spread,
 Eternal sunshine settles on its head.”

[MR. FRANKLIN'S FIFTH ADDRESS.]

Brethren Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I have still thirty minutes more to speak on this matter, and I do not intend to trouble my friend much more. He has dealt in this last speech in an article I can not use at this stage of affairs. I want to refer you to a few passages of Scripture he has passed over. I allude to Romans viii. 16, 17, which the gentleman has several times quoted to show that God will keep us; it is not hypothecated upon any condition whatever. “The Spirit itself beareth witness with our Spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.” I ask if this passage does not carry upon its face the very same contingency I have alluded to—that you keep his commandments, that you love him and do his will. I will call your attention to Paul’s keep-

ing the faith. He kept the faith, and so did Job; and it is much comfort to me to know they did so. But the question with me is not, whether these old saints kept the faith or not, whether a great many here among us keep the faith; but the question is, whether a saint can depart from the faith. What praise did Job and Paul deserve from Almighty God for such great patience and perseverance in keeping the faith, when it was impossible for them to depart from it? He commenced quoting from Paul. Paul casts his eye over all the past, then he places his eye upon the present, then to the future, and says to Timothy, another preacher of the gospel, "I have fought a good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith." "Well, Paul, what does that amount to?" He tells the present state of things: "I am ready now to be offered." "Suppose you have done these things." "Henceforth there is a crown of righteousness laid up for me which the Lord shall give me at that day, and to those that love his appearing." This case, you see, is hypothecated upon your loving his appearing and keeping the faith. The holy apostle of our Lord Jesus Christ, when he was nearing the shores of time and approaching the eternal world, took occasion to encourage the young preacher by saying, I have kept the faith and have fought a good fight down to this

day; and if you receive a golden crown, it is based upon the condition that you too keep the faith, that you honor the Redeemer, that you be true to him till the end."

He goes back to Matthew xvi., where the Lord said: "Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." He quotes that from his old scrap-book with his eyes open; but I think he will have to wipe his spectacles and read it over several times before he can, by any profound Biblical criticism, make it out the Church. Says he to Peter: "Who do you say I, the Son of man, am?" Says Peter: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." God said: "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Where is the antecedent to it? It is that which is the subject of discourse, and not the Church. The Lord himself was the foundation of the Church, and he said, the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; as if he had said, "I will triumph over the gates of hell; I will show the foundation upon which a Church can be built." He quotes a passage in Matthew vii.: "Not every one that sayeth unto me, Lord, Lord, shall

enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." He does not say, because you have believed, been born again, or are a child of God. No, sir; he says, he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. The question is not, whether you are one of the elect, whether you are a saint or not, but the question is whether you do the will of God. In another great and mighty expression he says: "He that heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him to a wise man, who built his house upon a rock; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon the house; and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock." If you will keep the commandments of God, the foundation will never fall. When I am setting forth the true doctrine, my friend says, amen; while he has been trying to prove to you, if you have ever been in the faith, you are sure of God. But as I have but a few minutes now, I must not detain you.

I want to make a brief recapitulation of the positions I have sustained in this controversy. The question is not, how many will fall, but it simply is can they fall or not. I gave the case of Simon the sorcerer, and showed you that he apostatized and fell from grace. In conclusion, I called his attention to Ezekiel xviii., and

threw him into a most outrageous predicament. After his first attempt at refuting it, I could not get him to pay the slightest attention to it. He dreads it as a burned child dreads the fire. What did he do with the balance of my proof-texts? He has a most profound love for the ridiculous; but if he can not find some rough and uncouth expression to apply to me, he then gives vent to the wanderings of his prolific imagination, and revels in the flowery fields of poesy. He tries to prove that Judas never was a disciple of Christ, in direct opposition to the clear statements of the gospel. God entrusted to him the power to perform miracles, and said he kept him through his name; and the holy writer tells us when Satan entered into his heart, but my friend tries to make it out that this man never was a saint. He got his fingers burned with this passage, and he steps back and says: "You don't think I am going to follow you through all these passages, do you?" I give you credit, brother Fisher, for having kept one promise. You have neither followed me nor tried to reply to my arguments; you let them go by default. I called his attention to the Apostle Paul, determined to find somebody whom he would admit was once a saint. Paul says: "I have labored to keep my body in subjection, lest having preached the gospel to others, I myself might

be a castaway.” Well, a man stands up, and, in the face of this, tells you a saint can not fall from grace. “Do you not know you was chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, and you can not possibly fall? Talk about laboring to keep your body in subjection, there can be no danger of its rebelling.” He says it is idle to admonish and warn believers against apostacy, and pays no attention to the numerous warnings I produce from the Bible; but, quoting a passage where the prophet speaks about dogs and hogs, seems to upbraid me for founding an argument upon the verse. If I said any thing about that, I confess it has been stricken from my memory, for I have not the most remote recollection of having quoted it. I referred to the passage where we are admonished to take a more earnest heed of the glorious things of everlasting life, and beware of letting them slip. But he gets up and impliedly says, “O there is no danger; it is impossible for you to let them slip.” I also referred him to the Israelites who fell in the wilderness by departing from the living God. But he says in reply, they did not depart from him, because they were never with him. Again, I called his attention to the warning of the apostle concerning a promise which we were liable to come short of, and called his attention to Hebrews vi., where it speaks of those who

were once enlightened, who have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of world to come. If they shall fall away—"They can not fall away," cries my worthy friend. He quotes where the apostle says, I am persuaded better things of you. Although Paul hoped they would persevere to the end, obey the true God, and keep the faith, he warns them to be careful, vigilant to keep their bodies in subjection, and to obey the commandments; which, if they do, he declares they shall never fall. Is not this in perfect consonance with all the teachings in the oracles of God?

I have noticed a number of times, when listening to my friend, how anxious he was to find expressions by which he could manifest the bitter feelings he felt towards me. I have not said any thing which could possibly, in the sight of God, be construed as unkind or ungentlemanly. I do not wish to irritate either him or his brethren, and I do not see why he should take such pleasure in this. I desire to inspire in the hearts of men a feeling of fellowship and kindness.

I pointed out to him the declaration of the apostle against those who sin wilfully in the sight of God, and what John said: "If any man says he has no sin, he is a liar and the

truth is not in him;" and, furthermore, that if we confess our sins we have an advocate with the Father. But, in reply to this, he can only say, "A saint can not sin wilfully." John did not refer to believers, and a saint will never have occasion to confess his sins, because it is out of his power to commit any. I called his attention to Galatians v.: "If we be circumcised not, we are fallen from grace;" but he paid no attention to it. He can only say in reply to such plain and positive declarations, that Christ will prevent all those who believe on him from falling from grace. I appeal to those here assembled—to the unregenerate, to the laymen, to the ministers, if the gentleman has not disregarded almost the entire mass of irrefragable testimony I have brought forward during this controversy, in substantiation of the impregnable position which I have assumed. Has he not given unequivocal demonstration of his entire inability to cope with the truth, which is mighty, and which will prevail. [*Time expired.*]

[MR. FISHER'S FIFTH REPLY.]

Brethren Moderators:

It would, in the estimation of this audience, be supremely ridiculous in me to make dogmatical assertions in reply to like statements which have already been made in your hearing. My opponent set out to prove that the saints can apostatize, fall from grace, and be lost. You are the jury, and it is your place to decide whether he has succeeded in the establishment of his position by reasonable arguments—of course, regarding his sophistry, ridicule, and misrepresentations with that attention only which such abortive attempts at subterfuge receive from intelligent minds. I have never stated, in one single instance, during the entire course of this debate, that a man who simply believes, has eternal life. In every instance where the promise has been referred to, it has been accompanied with conditional repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. In this, as in an hundred other instances, he has misrepresented me; but for which, in the presence of that Judge before whom he and myself must shortly stand, I have no unkind feelings in my heart towards him. These disagreeable misrepresentations I must attribute to some cause other than a will-

ful intention upon his part; and I am sorry I have been unable to make him understand me. In many of the passages which he has quoted, in futile endeavors to bolster up a new-taught dogma, or the vagaries of some morbose imagination long since passed into eternity, he has wrested the word of God from its true meaning, and has failed in every instance to quote those qualifying expressions which would set the matter before this assembly in its true light.

Did not the gentleman state in your hearing, that I said, condition or no condition, commandment or no commandment, if we were the elect of God, we would be saved any how. Now, I ask, when did I make any such statement as that? Did I not connect conditions in every instance with every promise God has made? and did I not say that the saint would as certainly perform the conditions as that the promise of fulfillment was given? My arguments and his assertions have already been placed on paper by the reporter, and the readers of this debate will be truly astonished when they see so many reckless remarks in my opponent's speeches. The bad spirit of the gentleman has been more particularly manifested during the discussion of this last proposition than upon any previous occasion. On Saturday night, failing to reply to my arguments, he poured forth a volley of unmitigated

abuse upon my head, and then exhibited the astonishing strength of his lungs, and the remarkable resonance of his nose, in an old-fashioned sing-song exhortation, in which he seemed to beg, in the most piteous tones, for the sympathy of the dear people, "while the big round tears ran in piteous chase down his innocent nose."

In his replication of the position which I have established beyond successful contradiction, by the irrefragable testimony of more than fifty witnesses inspired by God Almighty, and whose hearts were filled with the love of Jesus, he stood up and advocated that a saint can apostatize, fall from grace, and be lost. Now, if it is possible that a saint will never perform the conditions, why, it is possible that they will fall; but I say they will perform the conditions, and implicitly comply with the expressed commands; and that such is the case, I have given evidence on evidence, and would multiply instances, had he an opportunity to reply to them. I have given the case of Job, that man against whom the Devil brought his heaviest artillery—the gates of hell—but he stood as firm as the last mountain of the Deluge upon which the Ark of God rested. I have pointed likewise to the Apostle Paul—that man whose beard and locks were wet with the dungeon's dew, and whose back was fur-

rowed by the tyrant's lash; and that great company that John saw, whom no man could number, covering the hills of light, kneeling before the throne of eternity, wearing on immortal brows crowns of glory, and sweeping with magic skill a million harps of living melody in praise of God and the Lamb! These kept the faith, complied with the conditions, and are now pavilioned in a temple of never-fading light, over which the banner of eternal triumph shall for ever wave, and around whose columns of matchless transparency the deep-toned hallelujahs now roll, and will ever resound in glorious anthems to him who loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood! In those sainted ranks methinks I see a Johnson, a Noel, a Forbes, and many friends and relatives of my opponent, who complied with the conditions; and among those happy millions is my sweet mother, with her robe of glory and golden harp, singing songs to Moses and the Lamb. What a consolation, my beloved hearers, is contained in this glorious doctrine. Methinks I hear the saints of God gathering their strength and pouring it forth in one note—grace! grace! And amid the shouts of unnumbered millions, the top-stone is brought—grace, grace, unto it! In view of these facts, may I not be justified in the conclusion, that the saints will and can persevere

through grace to glory;—not through works, not through the law, for they can not be justified by the law of Moses, but only through grace to glory. To God be all the glory, praise, and dominion for ever, who alone is able to keep us from falling. [*Time expired.*]



the

American

Baptist

Association

ORIGIN — FAITH — PRACTICE

A. L. Patterson

CONCERNING THE AMERICAN BAPTIST ASSOCIATION

(Prepared by A. L. Patterson)

The American Baptist Association is, as the title implies, an association of churches. In 1905, what was known as the General Association came into existence when certain churches that had never worked with the Southern Baptist Convention and some that had but were dissatisfied with Southern Baptist Convention procedure, came together for the purpose of co-operating on Bible principles. This General Association was in operation until the name was changed to the American Baptist Association in 1924, with little or no changes in principles.

With few, if any, exceptions, the churches composing the American Baptist Association are in harmony with the following taken from **The Baptist Way Book**, Ben M. Bogard:

CHURCH COVENANT

On profession of our faith, having been baptized in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, we do now most solemnly and joyfully enter into covenant with one another as one body in Christ.

We engage, by the aid of the Holy Spirit, to walk together in Christian love; to strive for the advancement of this church in knowledge, holiness and comfort; to promote its prosperity and spirituality;

to sustain its worship, ordinances, discipline and doctrines, to contribute cheerfully and regularly to the support of its pastor, the expenses of the church, the relief of the poor, and the spread of the gospel throughout the world by methods in harmony with Acts 11:22; 13:1-4; 14:25-28.

We engage to maintain family and secret prayer, to religiously train our children, to seek the salvation of the unsaved about us, to walk circumspectly in the world, to be just in our dealings, faithful in our engagements, upright in our deportment, to avoid tattling, back-biting and excessive anger; to abstain from the sale and use of intoxicating drinks, and to be zealous in our efforts to advance the kingdom of our Savior.

We further engage to watch over one another in brotherly love; to remember each other in prayer; to aid each other in sickness and distress; to cultivate Christian sympathy in feeling and courtesy in speech; to be slow to take offense, but always ready for reconciliation, and mindful of the rules of our Savior, to secure it without delay.

We, moreover, engage that when we remove from this place we will, as soon as possible, unite with some other church, where we can carry out the spirit of this covenant, and the principles of God's Word.

☆ ☆ ☆

With few, if any, exceptions, these churches concur with the following:

DECLARATION OF FAITH

I. OF THE SCRIPTURES: We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction (II Tim. 3:16, 17); that it has God for its Author, salvation for its end (II Tim. 3:15), and truth without any mixture of error for its matter (Prov. 30:5, 6); that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us (Rom. 2:12; John 12:47, 48); and, therefore, is, and shall remain to the end of the world, the true center of Christian union (Phil. 3:16), and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds and opinions should be tried (I John 4:1; Isa. 8:20).

II. OF THE TRUE GOD: We believe that there is one, and only one living and true God, an infinite, intelligent Spirit, whose name is JEHOVAH, the Maker and Supreme Ruler of heaven and earth (John 4:24; Psalm 147:5; 83:18; Heb. 3:4; Rom. 1:20; Jer. 10:10); inexpressibly glorious in holiness (Exod. 15:11), and worthy of all possible honor, confidence, and love (Mark 12:30; Rev. 4:11); that in the unity of the Godhead there are three persons, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit (Matt. 28:19; John 15:16); equal in every divine perfection (John 10:30), and executing distinct but harmonious offices in the great work of redemption (Eph. 2:18; II Cor. 13:14).

III. OF THE FALL OF MAN: We believe that man was created in holiness, under the law of his

Maker (Gen. 1:27, 31; Eccl. 7:29); but by voluntary transgression fell from that holy and happy state (Gen. 3:6-24; Rom. 5:12); in consequence of which all mankind are now sinners (Rom. 5:19; John 3:6; Psalm 51:5), not by constraint but by choice (Isa. 53:6; Gen. 6:12; Rom. 3:9-18); being by nature utterly void of that holiness required by the law of God, positively inclined to evil, and therefore under just condemnation to eternal ruin (Eph. 2:13; Rom. 1:18-32; 2:1-16), without defence or excuse (Ezek. 18:19, 20; Rom. 1:20; 3:19).

IV. OF THE WAY OF SALVATION: We believe that the salvation of sinners is wholly of grace (Eph. 2:5; I John 4:10); through the mediatorial offices of the Son of God (John 3:16; 1:1-14); who by the appointment of the Father, freely took upon Him our nature, yet without sin (Phil. 2:6-7; Heb. 2:9-14); honored the divine law by His personal obedience (Isa. 42:21; Phil. 2:8), and by His death made a full atonement for our sins (Isa. 53:4-5; Matt. 20:28; Rom. 4:25); that having risen from the dead, He is now enthroned in heaven (Heb. 1:3-8; Col. 3:14); and united in His wonderful person the tenderest sympathies with divine perfection, He is in every way qualified to be a suitable, a compassionate, and an all-sufficient Savior (Heb. 7:25, 26; Col. 2:9; Heb. 2:18).

V. OF JUSTIFICATION: We believe that the great gospel blessing which Christ secures (John 1:16; Eph. 3:8) to such as believe in Him is justification (Acts 13:39; Rom. 8:1); that justification

includes the pardon of sin (Rom. 5:9) and the promise of eternal life on principles of righteousness (Rom. 5:17; Titus 3:5, 6); that it is bestowed, not in consideration of any works of righteousness which we have done, but solely through repentance toward God and faith in the Redeemer's blood (Rom. 4:4, 5); by virtue of which faith His perfect righteousness is freely imputed to us of God (Rom. 5:19; 4:24, 25); that it brings us into a state of most blessed peace and favor with God and secures every other blessing needful for time and eternity (Rom. 5:1-3, 11; Matt. 6:33).

VI. OF THE FREENESS OF SALVATION: We believe that the blessings of salvation are made free to all by the Gospel of Christ (Isa. 55:1; Rev. 22:17); that it is the immediate duty of all to accept them by a cordial penitent and obedient faith (Rom. 16:26; Mark 1:15; Rom. 1:15-17); and that nothing prevents the salvation of the greatest sinner on earth, but his own inherent depravity and voluntary rejection of the Gospel of Christ (John 5:40; Rom. 9:32); which rejection involves him in an aggravated condemnation (John 3:19; Matt. 11:20).

VII. OF GRACE IN REGENERATION: We believe that in order to be saved, sinners must be regenerated, or born again (John 3:3, 6, 7); that regeneration consists in giving a holy disposition to the mind (II Cor. 5:17; Ezek. 36:26; Rom. 2:28, 29); that it is effected in a manner above our comprehension by the power of the Holy Spirit, in connec-

tion with divine truth (John 3:8; 1:13; James 1:16-18); so as to secure our voluntary obedience to the Gospel of Christ (I Peter 1:22-25; I John 5:1; Eph. 4:20-24); and that its proper evidence appears in the holy fruits of repentance, and faith, and newness of life (Eph. 5:9; Rom. 8:9; Gal. 5:16-23; Eph. 3:14-21).

VIII. OF REPENTANCE AND FAITH: We believe that repentance and faith are sacred duties, and also inseparable graces, wrought in our souls in regeneration (Mark 1:15; Acts 11:18; Eph. 2:8; I John 5:1); whereby being deeply convinced of our guilt, danger, and helplessness, and of the way of salvation by Christ (John 16:8; Acts 2:37, 38; 16:30, 31), we turn to God with unfeigned contrition, confession, and supplication for mercy (Luke 18:13; James 4:7-10); at the same time heartily receiving the Lord Jesus Christ as our Prophet, Priest, and King, and relying on Him alone as the only and all-sufficient Savior (Rom. 10:9-13; Acts 3:22, 23; Heb. 1:8).

IX. OF GOD'S PURPOSE OF GRACE: We believe that election is the eternal purpose of God, according to which He graciously regenerates, sanctifies, and saves sinners (II Tim. 1:8, 9; Eph. 1:3-14; Rom. 11:5, 6); that being perfectly consistent with the free agency of man, it comprehends all the means in connection with the end (II Thes. 2:13, 14; Acts 13:48; John 10:16); that it is a most glorious display of God's sovereign goodness, being infinitely free, wise, holy and unchangeable (Exod.

33:18, 19; Matt. 20:15; Eph. 1:11; Rom. 9:23, 24; 11:28-36); that it utterly excludes boasting and promotes humility, love, prayer, praise, trust in God, and active imitation of His free mercy (I Cor. 4:7; 1:26-31; Col. 3:12); that it encourages the use of means in the highest degree (II Tim. 2:10; I Cor. 9:2; Rom. 8:28-30; John 6:37-40); that it may be ascertained by its effects in all who truly believe the Gospel of Christ (I Thes. 1:4-10); that it is the foundation of Christian assurance (Rom. 8:28-31; 11:29); and that to ascertain with regard to ourselves demands and deserves the utmost diligence (II Peter 1:10, 11; Phil. 3:12).

X. OF SANCTIFICATION: We believe that sanctification is the process by which, according to the will of God, we are made partakers of His holiness (I Thes. 4:3; 5:23; II Cor. 7:1); that it is a progressive work (Prov. 4:18; II Peter 1:5-8; Phil. 3:12-16); that it is begun in regeneration (John 2:29; Rom. 8:5; Phil. 1:9-11); and that it is carried on in the hearts of believers by the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, the Sealer and Comforter, in the continual use of the appointed means—especially, the Word of God, self-examination, self-denial, watchfulness, and prayer (Phil. 2:12, 13; Eph. 4:11, 12; I Peter 2:2).

XI. OF THE PERSEVERANCE OF SAINTS: We believe that such only are real believers as endure unto the end (John 8:31; I John 2:27, 28; 3:9); that their persevering attachment to Christ is the grand mark which distinguishes them from superficial

professions (I John 2:19; Matt. 13:20, 21); that a special providence watches over their welfare (Rom. 8:28; Matt. 6:30-33); and that they are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation (Phil. 1:6; 2:12, 13; Jude 24, 25).

XII. OF THE HARMONY OF THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL: We believe that the law of God is the eternal and unchangeable rule of His moral government (Rom. 3:31; Matt. 5:17; Luke 16:17); that it is holy, just and good (Rom. 7:12, 14-22; Gal. 3:21); and that the inability which the Scriptures ascribe to fallen men to fulfill its precepts, arises entirely from their love of sin (Rom. 8:7, 8; Jer. 13:23); to deliver from which, and to restore them through a Mediator to unfeigned obedience to the holy law, is one great end of the Gospel of Christ, and of the means of grace connected with the establishment of the visible church (Rom. 8:2, 4; 10:4; Jude 20, 21; Matt. 16:17, 18).

XIII. OF A GOSPEL CHURCH: We believe that a church of Christ is a congregation of baptized believers (I Cor. 1:1-13; Matt. 18:17; Acts 5:11; 8:1); associated by covenant in the faith and fellowship of the Gospel of Christ (Acts 2:41, 42, 47; II Cor. 8:5; I Cor. 5:12, 13); observing the ordinances of Christ (I Cor. 11:22, 23; II Thess. 3:6; Rom. 16:17-20); governed by His laws (Matt. 28:20; John 14:15, 21; I John 4:21); and exercising the gifts, rights, and privileges invested in them by His Word (Eph. 4:7; I Cor. 14:12; Phil. 1:27); that its only Scriptural officers are pastors and deacons (Phil. 1:1;

Acts 14:23; I Tim. 3); whose qualifications, claims and duties are defined in the Epistles of Timothy and Titus.

XIV. OF BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER: We believe that Christian baptism is the immersion in water of a believer (Acts 8:36-39; Matt. 3:5, 6; John 3:22, 23); into the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit (Matt. 28:19; Acts 10:47, 48); to show forth in a solemn and beautiful emblem our faith in the crucified, buried, and risen Saviour, with its effect, in our death to sin and resurrection to a new life (Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12); that it is a prerequisite to the privilege of a church relation; and to the Lord's Supper (Acts 2:41, 42; Matt. 28:19, 20); in which the members of the church by the sacred use of bread and wine, are to commemorate together the dying love of Christ (I Cor. 11:26; Matt. 26:26-29); preceded always by solemn self-examination (I Cor. 11:28; 5:1, 8).

XV. OF THE LORD'S DAY: We believe that the first day of the week is the Lord's Day (Acts 20:7; Col. 2:16, 17; John 20:19; I Cor. 16:1, 2); and is to be kept sacred to religious purposes (Exod. 20:8; Rev. 1:10; Psalm 118:24); by abstaining from all secular labor and sinful recreations (Isa. 58:13, 14; 56: 2-8); by the devout observance of all the means of grace, both private (Psalm 118:15), and public (Heb. 10:24, 25; Acts 11:26; 13:14); and by preparation for that rest that remaineth for the people of God (Heb. 4:3-11).

XVI. OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT: We believe that civil government is of divine appointment, for the interest and good order of human society (Rom. 13:1-7; Deut. 16:18; II Sam. 23:3); and that magistrates are to be prayed for, conscientiously honored, and obeyed (Matt. 22:21; Titus 3:1; I Peter 2:13; I Tim. 2:1-8); except only in things opposing to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ (Acts 5:29; Matt. 10:28; Dan. 3:15-18; 6:7-10), who is the only Lord of the conscience, and the Prince of the kings of the earth (Matt. 23:10; Rom. 14:4; Rev. 19:16; Psalm 72:11).

XVII. OF THE RIGHTEOUS AND THE WICKED: We believe that there is a radical and essential difference between the righteous and the wicked (Mal. 3:18; Prov. 12:26; Rom. 6:16); that such only as through faith are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and sanctified by the Spirit of our God, are truly righteous in His esteem (Rom. 1:17; 7:6; 6:18-22; I John 2:29; 3:7); while all such as continue in impenitence and unbelief are in His sight wicked, and under the curse (I John 5:19; Gal. 3:10; John 3:36); and this distinction holds among men both in and after death (Prov. 14:32; 10:24; Luke 16:25).

XVIII. CHRIST'S SECOND COMING; THE MILLENNIUM; AND ARMAGEDDON: We believe that Christ will come to the earth the second time, personally and bodily; that at His coming the saints will be caught up to meet Him in the air; that after this there will be on earth a period of exceedingly

great trouble described in the Bible as the Great Tribulation; the battle of Armageddon will be fought; that also at Christ's coming the saints will be judged for rewards according to their works; that Christ will descend to the earth, personally and bodily, and will rule and reign over the earth in peace, righteousness, and justice, for a period of one thousand years (Deut. 30:3; Acts 1:9-11; I Cor. 15:51, 52; I Thes. 4:13-18; Rev. 19:7; Matt. 24:15-26; Mark 13:14-23; Rev. 19:17-21; II Cor. 5:10; Isa. 2:1-4; Isa. 65:18-25; Rev. 20:4-6).

XIX. THE JUDGMENTS: We believe there will be a judgment of rewards for the righteous; that this judgment will take place at Christ's coming to receive His saints; that the wicked will be judged at the close of the Millennial (the one thousand years' reign of Christ on earth) age (II Cor. 5:10; Psalm 58:11; I Cor. 3:8, 11-15; Rev. 11:18; Rev. 22:12; Rev. 20:12-15).

XX. THE FINAL STATES: We believe that this earth itself will be redeemed from the curse of sin and fitted as the eternal dwelling place of the people of God; that this fitting of the earth for the eternal home of the redeemed will be by purification by fire; that the finally impenitent and incorrigible wicked will be cast, both souls and resurrected bodies, into the lake of fire and brimstone, where they will be punished forever and forever (Luke 12:5; Rom. 8:20-22; Heb. 1:10-12; II Peter 3:10-13; Rev. chapters 21, 22; Psalm 9:17;

Prov. 27:20; Ezek. 31:16; Matt. 5:29-30; Matt. 10:28; Jude 7; Rev. 20:10).

(Articles 1 through 17 from Baptist Way Book, by Ben M. Bogard. Articles 18 through 20 from J. E. Cobb Manual, with minor changes).



ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT OF THE AMERICAN BAPTIST ASSOCIATION

PREAMBLE: With faith in God, and unquestioning acceptance of the Bible as the Word of God, and earnest prayers for the blessings of God, we offer to all Missionary Baptist Churches of Christ the following Articles of Agreement.

ARTICLE I.—NAME: The name of this Association shall be the American Baptist Association.

ARTICLE II.—OBJECT: The object of this Association is to encourage co-operation and Christian activity among the churches, to promote interest in, and encourage Missions on a New Testament basis among all people, to stimulate interest in Christian literature and general benovolence, and to provide a medium through which the churches may co-operate in these enterprises.

ARTICLE III—MEMBERS:

Section 1. This Association shall be composed of regular Missionary Baptist Churches.

Section 2. The Annual or called sessions of this Association shall be held by Messengers elected by the churches composing said Association.

Section 3. Each Church shall be entitled to three Messengers whose qualifications shall be determined by the Church electing them.

ARTICLE IV—NATURE: This Association is the joint co-operation of the churches composing it.

ARTICLE V—DOCTRINAL STATUS: This Association shall recognize the freedom of speech as essential to the highest achievements in its work. It shall stand or fall on its own conformity of truth. It shall exercise no ecclesiastical authority, but it shall by every precaution recognize the sovereignty of every individual church. It shall encourage on the part of the churches and messengers the greatest possible freedom of expression in discussing matters pertaining to its work, and in the pre-eminence of missions and evangelism in the work of the churches.

ARTICLE VI—POWERS: The powers of this Association shall be limited to the execution according to the teachings of the New Testament of the will of the churches composing it; and the Association, in annual session, shall elect such officers as are necessary for its deliberation and work and appoint such committees as are needed and transact other business as may be directed by the churches.

ARTICLE VII—OFFICERS:

Section 1. The officers of this Association shall be President, three Vice Presidents, two Recording Secretaries, Treasurer and such Corresponding Secretaries as the needs of the work may demand, whose duty shall be such as usually devolve upon such offices.

Section 2. All officers shall be chosen annually, and shall hold their offices until their successors are elected, and the same thing shall be true of all members of standing committees. All officers shall be elected by acclamation.

Section 3. The Recording Secretaries, in addition to keeping the records of this Association, will superintend the printing and distribution of minutes of such meetings as the churches may direct.

Section 4. The election of the officers of this Association shall be held on the last day of the annual session, and they shall assume office at the opening of the next annual session. This is not to include officers who make annual reports to the Association. These may be elected at any time after the reports of the officers have been received by the association.

Section 5. In all votes of this Association, a majority of the votes cast shall decide questions, except in the cases of amendments to Articles of Agreement, in which case two-thirds majority shall be necessary.

Section 6. In the event that the Association shall

fail at its annual session to elect a Treasurer or Corresponding Secretaries, the same shall be elected by the Missionary Committee as soon as possible after the adjournment of the session of this Association.

Section 7. It shall be the duty of the Treasurer or Corresponding Secretaries to conduct all the correspondence of the Association and of the Missionary Committee, to conduct the work of said committee as financial agent of it, and he shall make in writing a full annual report of all important matters of his office to the regular session of this Association, and such other reports as the Missionary Committee may require.

Section 8. It shall be the duty of the Treasurer to take charge of money and valuables not specifically entrusted to someone else and to dispose of same as he may be directed by this Association, or instructed by the Articles of Agreement, and to report in writing in full the receipts and expenditures of his office to the regular session of this Association.

ARTICLE VIII—FUNDS:

Section 1. All funds of this Association shall be raised by voluntary donations secured purely upon the merits of the cause in the interest of which appeals are made for gifts; provided this is not to prevent the use of any income or any property that may be acquired by donations or purchase.

Section 2. Distribution of funds shall be author-

ized by an act of this Association, or by the act of properly authorized committees of this Association, hereinafter provided for; but in no instance shall the Association, or any committee of it, use means in violation of the expressed preference of the donor.

Section 3. All funds of this Association shall pass through the hands of the Treasurer in the manner hereinafter provided for. This is to include money, deeds, and whatever may be entrusted to any committee to be used by said committee under instructions of this Association.

Section 4. The Treasurer of this Association shall hold all funds received between sessions of this Association subject to order of the committee entitled to use it.

ARTICLE IX—MISSIONARY COMMITTEE:

Section 1. The messengers of the co-operating churches of this Association shall elect annually a Missionary Committee, which shall consist of twenty-five members, nine of whom shall constitute a quorum. Any co-operating church may elect from their membership one committeeman to serve with the regular Committee elected by the messengers.

Section 2. It shall be the duty of the Missionary Committee of this Association to act as executive of the Association between the sessions, to carry out the object of this Association, and to attend all the needed matters not otherwise provided for by

special provisions, and to render an annual report of this work to the Association.

Section 3. The membership of all committees shall be fairly distributed among the various sections and organizations of churches which co-operate with this Association.

ARTICLE X—LITERATURE COMMITTEE:

Section 1. The messengers to this Association shall elect annually a Committee on Literature to consist of sixteen members, five of whom shall constitute a quorum.

Section 2. The Literature Committee shall act in its field as an executive of the Association between the annual sessions, performing all duties that may be entrusted to said committee by the Association and fill vacancies between sessions that may occur in the office of Business Manager and Editors.

ARTICLE XI—MEETINGS: The regular meeting of the Church Messengers shall be at such time and place as the assembled Messengers may appoint, and the Missionary Committee here empowered to make a called session when necessary.

ARTICLE XII—AMENDMENTS: The Articles of Agreement shall not be changed or amended unless the change of amendment be offered in writing on the first day of the regular session and be permitted to lay over until some subsequent day at

that session, and then it can be adopted only by a vote of two-thirds majority, in case two-thirds of the churches shall demand an amendment the vote shall be taken by churches.



DOCTRINAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN BAPTIST ASSOCIATION

1. We believe in the infalible, verbal inspiration of the whole Bible, II Tim. 3:16.
2. The Triune God, Matt. 28:19.
3. The Genesis Account of Creation.
4. The Virgin Birth of Jesus Christ, Matt. 1:20.
5. The Deity of Jesus Christ.
6. His crucifixion and suffering as vicarious and substitutionary.
7. The bodily resurrection and ascension of Christ and the bodily resurrection of His saints, I Cor. 15th Chapter.
8. The second coming of Christ, personal and bodily as the crowning event of this Gentile age, Acts 1:11.
9. The Bible doctrine of eternal punishment of the finally impenitent, Matt. 25:48.
10. We also hold in common what real Baptists have ever held: That the great commission was

given to the churches only; that in kingdom activities the church is the unit and only unit that the churches have, and should exercise equal authority, and responsibility should be met by them according to their several anilities.

11. That all co-operating bodies, such as Associations, Conventions, and Boards or Committees, etc., are, and properly should be the servants of the churches.
12. We believe that the great commission teaches there has been a succession of Missionary Baptist Churches from the days of Christ to this day.
13. We believe that Baptism to be valid, must be administered by a Scriptural Baptist Church.

☆ ☆ ☆

A STATEMENT OF MISSION POLICY

PREAMBLE: Remembering the Lord is not the author of confusion and praying that in fellowship we may truly be laborers together with God; we, as your committee, submit to you the re-affirmation of the mission practices of the churches of the American Baptist Association and set forth to the world to show our policies with reference to mission work.

When this statement has been adopted by the messengers, it shall become a permanent part of our annual and may be changed in the same man-

ner as provided for in Article 12 of our Statement of Principles.

SECTION I. The messengers of the churches of the American Baptist Association do not recommend any man to the mission field unless he has been first elected a missionary by the church of his membership, said church being associated with and subscribing to the principles and practices of the churches of the American Baptist Association.

SECTION II. We recognize that a missionary elected by this local church, if it be a Scriptural church, is a Scriptural missionary, without a recommendation from the messengers from the churches of the American Baptist Association.

SECTION III. Any messenger may request an individual vote on any name recommended for endorsement by the messengers in annual session.

SECTION IV. We recognize as Scriptural the right of the messengers in annual session to recommend stipulated salaries for the missionaries, or, if the missionary prefers, he may accept monies designated for him, or sent to him without stipulated salary.

SECTION V. UNDESIGNATED FUNDS: Foreign Missions: Any foreign missionary not on salary may be paid a sufficient amount to bring his wage to a figure equal to the recommended wage of interstate

missionaries, according to the exchange value of the dollar, if funds are available after salaries are paid. Any surplus in undesignated foreign mission funds shall be carried over until the next annual session. Inter-state Missions: Inter-state Missionaries shall be paid amounts sufficient to equalize the wage of all missionaries, if funds are available, to the amount of salary set for Inter-State Missionaries, after salaries are paid.

The salary and expenses incidental to the office of the Secretary-Treasurer, are to be paid from undesignated Inter-State Mission funds.

Any surplus is to be carried over until the next annual session.

DESIGNATED FUNDS:

All designated funds are to be distributed by the Secretary-Treasurer as designated.

SECTION VI. All missionaries of the churches laboring under the recommendation of the messengers of the American Baptist Association are requested to submit an itemized monthly report to the Secretary-Treasurer of all receipts, showing how much was used for personal use, and how other funds were used.

SECTION VII. We recognize the Secretary-Treasurer of the American Baptist Association as being one of the Inter-State Missionaries, and is so recognized by the messengers and the churches.

SECTION VIII. Any person recommended by the messengers to the churches as a foreign missionary who travels among the churches to raise passage funds is requested to deposit such funds as raised for passage to his foreign field with the Secretary-Treasurer in the foreign missions undesignated funds in the event he does not really enter his foreign field.

A COMPARISON OF THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION AND THE AMERICAN BAPTIST ASSOCIATION BASED ON THEIR RESPECTIVE YEAR BOOKS OF 1957: CONVENTION BOOK, PAGES 26-28; ASSOCIATION BOOK, PAGES 96-99.

COMMENT BY A. L. P.: Compare ABSENCE of respect for the LOCAL CHURCH in the Convention citations and the RESPECT for the LOCAL CHURCH in the Association citations.

The American Baptist Association Articles of Agreement contain a sound set of doctrinal statements while NO REFERENCE TO THE SCRIPTURES is found in the Convention Constitution.

(Use of bold-face type and parenthesis for emphasis by A. L. P.)

FROM THE CHARTER OF THE CONVENTION

An act to incorporate five men named with others, their associates and successors, to constitute the **SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION** was approved by Georgia Senate and House of Representatives Dec. 27, 1845.

PURPOSE OF THE CONVENTION

FROM CONVENTION CHARTER: for the purpose of eliciting, combining and directing the energies of the **Baptist Denomination of Christians**, for the propagation of the gospel, **any law, usage or custom to the contrary notwithstanding.**

FROM INTRODUCTION TO CONSTITUTION: Messengers from **Missionary Societies, Churches and other religious bodies of the Baptist Denomination . . .** for the purpose of eliciting, combining and directing the energies of the **denomination.**

ARTICLE III OF THE CONSTITUTION: It is the purpose of the Convention to provide a general organization **for Baptists . . .** for the promotion of Christian missions . . . and any other objects such as Christian education, benevolent enterprises, and social services which **it** (the Convention) may deem proper and advisable.

FROM PREAMBLE OF THE ASSOCIATION

With faith in God, and unquestioning acceptance of the Bible as the Word of God, and earnest prayers for the blessings of God, we offer to all Missionary Baptist Churches of Christ the following Articles of Agreement

PURPOSE OF THE ASSOCIATION

The object of this Association is to encourage co-operation and Christian activity **among the churches**, to promote interest in and encourage Missions on a New Testament basis among all the people, to stimulate interest in Christian literature and general benevolence, and to provide a medium through which **the churches** may co-operate in these enterprises.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE CONVENTION

Article III. The Convention shall consist of messengers . . .

Sec. 1. One messenger for each regular Baptist Church . . . a bona fide contributor to the Convention's work during the preceding fiscal year.

Sec. 2. One additional messenger from each such church for every 250 members, or for each \$250.00 paid to the work of the Convention during the preceding fiscal year . . . (no church to have more than ten messengers.)

NATURE OF THE CONVENTION

Article IV. While **independent and sovereign in its own sphere**, the Convention does not claim and will never attempt to exercise any authority over any other Baptist body, whether church, auxiliary, association or convention.

(NOTE BY A. L. P. This puts the Convention auxiliaries **and** associations on equality with the church.)

MEMBERSHIP OF THE ASSOCIATION

Article III, Sec. 1. This Association shall be composed of regular Missionary Baptist **Churches**.

Section 3. Each church shall be entitled to three messengers whose qualifications shall be determined by the **church** electing them.

NOTE BY A. L. P.: From a business standpoint, the numerical and financial basis of representation in the Convention might seem fair, but would you be willing to give votes in our political elections to citizens in proportion to the members of their families and the amount they pay in taxes? If such were practiced, would not the wealthy soon control the government and take advantage of the poor? Then, may not the same result from the numerical basis of representation in the Convention?

NATURE OF THE ASSOCIATION

Article IV. This Association is the joint co-operation of the **churches composing it**.

Article V. This Association shall recognize the freedom of speech as essential to the highest achievements in its work. It shall stand or fall on its own conformity to truth. It shall exercise no ecclesiastical authority, but it shall by every precaution recognize the sovereignty of **every individual church**. It shall encourage on the part of the **churches** and messengers the greatest possible freedom of expression in discussing matters pertaining to its work, and in the pre-eminence of missions and evangelism in the **work of the churches**.

MISSIONARIES OF THE CONVENTION

Article IX. All missionaries **appointed by the Convention's boards** must, previous to their appointment, furnish (to the Convention's boards) evidence of piety, zeal for their Master's kingdom, conviction of truth as held by Baptists, and talent for missionary service.

MISSIONARIES OF THE ASSOCIATION

Section I. Statement of Mission Policy.

The messengers of the churches of the American Baptist Association do not recommend any man to the mission field unless he has **first been elected a missionary by the church of his membership.**

Section II. We recognize that a missionary elected by **this local church**, if it be a Scriptural church, is a Scriptural missionary without a recommendation from the messengers from the churches of the American Baptist Association.



For Free Distribution — Order From
BAPTIST SUNDAY SCHOOL COMMITTEE
of the
AMERICAN BAPTIST ASSOCIATION
214-216 East Broad St. Texarkana, Ark.-Tex.